

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, October 23, 1995
Volume 31—Number 42
Pages 1831–1892

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

- California, Concert For Hope in Hollywood—1858
- Connecticut
 - Thomas J. Dodd Archives and Research Center in Storrs, dedication—1839
 - University of Connecticut in Storrs—1840
- National Medals of Science and Technology, presentation ceremony—1873
- Ohio
 - Midwest Economic Conference, opening session in Columbus—1883
 - Ohio State University in Columbus—1888
- Radio address—1838
- Texas
 - Dinner in Houston—1864
 - Kelly Air Force Base in San Antonio—1859, 1860
 - Luncheon in Dallas—1853
 - University of Texas at Austin—1847
- Virginia, Business Council in Williamsburg—1831

Communications to Congress

- Budget deferrals, message transmitting—1880
- “Employment Non-Discrimination Act,” letter to Senator Kennedy on proposed legislation—1881

Executive Orders

- Interagency Security Committee—1881

Interviews With the News Media

- New conference, October 19 (No. 103)—1876

Proclamations

- National Character Counts Week—1846
- National Forest Products Week—1847

Supplementary Materials

- Acts approved by the President—1892
- Checklist of White House press releases—1891
- Digest of other White House announcements—1890
- Nominations submitted to the Senate—1891

Editor’s Note: The President was in Des Moines, IA, on October 20, the closing date of this issue. Releases and announcements issued by the Office of the Press Secretary but not received in time for inclusion in this issue will be printed next week.

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding week.

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under

regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for \$80.00 per year (\$137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for \$93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is \$3.00 (\$3.75 for foreign mailing).

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*.

Week Ending Friday, October 20, 1995

**Remarks to the Business Council in
Williamsburg, Virginia**

October 13, 1995

Thank you very much. The last time I was with the Woolards we were in Jackson Hole, Wyoming, in the Grand Tetons. And this outfit would have been highly inappropriate there. I felt more at home, but I saw Ed tonight and I kind of—I'm jealous of the beautiful shirt. I want to know where you got it. *[Laughter]* I'm so glad to see all of you. I know some of our administration members have been here—Secretary Rubin, who feels right at home. I still can't believe Bob Rubin is a Democrat. *[Laughter]* He told me not very long ago we were going to have to change the currency to avoid counterfeiting. And I said, "Well, all right." And he said, "But I want to start with 100-dollar bills." *[Laughter]* So that's where we started. I have reviewed a little bit about who spoke here today and what they said, and, Ed, if Hugh Sidey really said that, he must have been awful tough on the people who are running against me. *[Laughter]*

I want to talk to you tonight about, obviously, about the major controversy presently raging in Washington about the balanced budget. But I want to try to set the stage for what this really means and what's really going on. And I'd like to begin with what I think is the most important thing, which is what kind of country we live in and what kind of country we wish to live in and what kind of country we wish to leave for our children and our grandchildren. That, after all, is the most important thing of all.

When I sought this job in 1992, I did it because I wanted to restore the American dream for all of our people and because I wanted this country to go into the next century still as the world's leader for freedom and peace and prosperity and democracy. Because I really believe that we're all better off in a country where people have oppor-

tunity but exercise responsibility, where we strengthen work but we also strengthen our families, and where we recognize that the real power in America should be at the community level where people work together and where they deal with each other directly, instead of through the filters that exist between me and Washington and you where you live.

This is a remarkable period of success for America's economy. All of you are doing a remarkable job. We've had a great 2½ years. And I believe there are better times ahead if we make the right decisions. It's a time of profound change. We're moving from the industrial to the information and technology age. We've moved out of the cold war into a global marketplace. We have problems, to be sure, but they're nowhere near as great as the opportunities we have.

When I sought the Presidency, I said that I wanted to do three things: I wanted to restore pro-growth economics. I wanted to put mainstream values back at the heart of our social policy. And I wanted to give America a modern Government that was more entrepreneurial and smaller and gave more authority to the State and local governments, to the private sector, and operated more as a partner with others to build a better America.

I said then, and I believe I have been true to this, that I wanted to see new ideas injected into our political life, everything from welfare reform to national service to empowerment zones for our inner cities to the reinventing Government program that the Vice President has done such a good job with. I said I would make a good-faith effort to move beyond the partisan labels that had divided people so much in the past. And believe it or not, I have done my best to do that. It's a lot harder in Washington than it is in the State capitals and the cities of the country, but it can be done and it will be done again, I believe, in the next few weeks.

I also believed then and I believe more strongly now that in a time of change, it's important that the President make decisions based on their long-term impact as opposed to their short-term benefits or burdens.

Now, if you look at the last 2½ years, you must all be very proud. Our country has produced 7½ million jobs, 2½ million new homeowners, about 2 million new small business owners, the largest number of new small businesses in such a time period in the history of the United States, a record number of new self-made millionaires. Trade has increased in the last 3 years from 4 percent in '93, 10 percent in '94, and it's going up 16 percent this year—our exports. The deficit has come from \$290 billion a year down to \$160 billion a year.

Of course, there are still problems. In any period of profound change, there tends to be a big disruption and a significant problem of income inequality. We have that in America. We need to get more energy and growth back into middle class families' incomes. We have still some isolated areas in our country that have not felt the benefits of this recovery. And I believe that the budget proposal now in Congress would undermine our economic growth in the future unless it's modified significantly, and I'll say more about that in a moment.

I think the policies of this administration have made a contribution to that economic record by reducing the deficit; by expanding trade through NAFTA and GATT and taking all those outdated cold war controls off of our high technology exports; by concluding over 80 trade agreements through the efforts of Ambassador Kantor, including 15 with Japan alone; by investing in technology, research and development, and defense conversion; and by working with so many of you to manifest the real commitment to the education of all Americans, more money but also higher standards, higher expectations, and more accountability in education.

If you look at the question of our social problems and whether we've been successful in putting middle class values into our approach, you can all be somewhat hopeful there. The crime rate is down in almost every place in America. The murder rate is down. The welfare rolls are down. The food stamp

rolls are down. The poverty rate is down. The teen pregnancy rate has gone down for 2 years in a row. Americans are reasserting their beliefs in old-fashioned personal, family, and community responsibility. And it is beginning to work.

Yes, we have some problems. We still need to pass a national welfare reform plan, I believe. We still need to avoid the tendency that's now alive in Congress to believe that all you need to do on the crime problem is to put people in jail and we don't need anything to do with prevention and giving our young people something to say yes to. But basically we are moving in the right direction to reassert and reinsert into American life mainstream values.

And I believe the initiatives of our administration have played a role in that: The crime bill, which is putting 100,000 more police on the street, keeping repeat offenders off the street; passing the Brady bill; passing the assault weapons ban; doing things that enable our local communities to help prevent crimes. I think it's making a difference.

I believe the work we've done and what the New York Times called "a quiet revolution" in welfare—our administration has given 35 States over 40 separate approvals to get around Federal rules and regulations to move people from welfare to work. When the Congress wouldn't pass the bill, we just decided to reform welfare State by State, community by community. We have offered all 50 States within any 30-day period a complete relief from any number of Federal rules and regulations if they will present a comprehensive plan to move people from welfare to work without hurting their children.

I think when we almost doubled the family tax credit that President Reagan said was the best antipoverty program the country had ever come up with, so that we can now say that anybody who works 40 hours a week and has children in the home will not live in poverty, that was a major step toward rewarding work and family and helping us to reform welfare and get people out of welfare into the work rolls.

I think the national service program is an important advance. We celebrated its first year yesterday with a young woman from Kansas City who's working her way through

college from an inner-city neighborhood in Kansas City with a project of young volunteers who have closed 44 crack houses in Kansas City in the last year. And this is the kind of thing being done by these young people all over America, whether they're building houses with Habitat for Humanity, tutoring kids in rural Kentucky where they have increased the grade level in reading by three-fold in one year, or helping to fight the crime problem.

All these things manifest our values. And something I know that means a lot to all of you, we have tried to give the American people a more modern Government. The size of the Federal Government tonight when I left Washington was 163,000 smaller than it was the day I became President. It's the smallest Federal Government since John Kennedy was President. We will reduce it by another 110,000 in the next 2 years, no matter what the Congress does with this budget. This Government as a percentage of the civilian nonfarm payroll is the smallest Government the United States has had in Washington since 1933.

Now, those are facts. We've reduced 16,000 pages of regulations, cut the regulations of the Small Business Administration by 50 percent, the regulations of the Education Department by 40 percent. Next year, the paperwork time that businesses spend fooling with the Environmental Protection Agency will be down by 25 percent.

More important than all that to me, I think our Government's working better. The Small Business Administration has cut its budget by 40 percent and doubled its loan output. The Export-Import Bank is helping small businesses that never knew what it was before to sell their products all around the world. The Commerce Department and the State Department have done more good for American businesses overseas than any Commerce Department and State Department in modern history. And every one of you who has worked with them knows that that is the absolute truth. We are moving forward to give you a Government that works.

The automobile industry has been working with us in partnership to produce a clean car. It is a big deal. 1995 was the hottest year for the planet Earth since the present tem-

perature system was devised. China is growing rapidly. If everybody in China winds up with a car and you don't want the atmosphere of this Earth to burn up, we had better find an efficient way of moving people around. And this is the sort of thing that we're trying to do.

Now, let me tell you this; this will probably surprise you more than anything: Every year, Business Week—hardly an arm of the Democratic Party or of my administration—recognizes outstanding businesses for performance in various categories. This year in the category of service to consumers by telephone, the winner was not L.L. Bean or Federal Express but the Social Security Administration of your Federal Government. So I think that we have made a contribution to modernizing the Federal Government. It's smaller. It's less bureaucratic. It is more entrepreneurial. It still has dumb things in the rules, and it does dumb things that drive me crazy that I find out about after it's over. But it is better than it was before by a very, very long shot.

The most important thing is, we're trying to help move decisions back where people make them. The mayor of Chicago is here. Chicago received one of our empowerment zones, a new idea helping to attract private investment into inner cities to grow the economy and give people a stake in America's future. Chicago received more funds for police not because we know how to prevent crime, but they do if they have the means to do it, and funds for prevention to support programs like the ones in Chicago that have lowered the crime rate, even though they make fodder for congressional speeches, like midnight basketball. Better a kid on a basketball court than on a corner selling drugs or mugging somebody and winding up in jail. We didn't make the decisions; they make the decisions at the local level.

We finally passed a bill to stop mandating costs on State and local governments that we don't help them pay for. These are the kinds of things that are going on. We are moving in the right direction, your country is, and you ought to be proud of it.

And America has been gratified to be a part of making peace in the Middle East, progress in Northern Ireland, the cease-fire in Bosnia, making sure that for the first time

since the dawn of the nuclear age there aren't any missiles pointed at Americans or their children tonight. North Korea is moving away from its nuclear program, and, by the grace of God, we might get a comprehensive test ban treaty on all nuclear testing next year. We seem to be headed in that direction.

Now, what does the future hold? First, we do have to balance the budget. It's the right thing to do to take the burden of debt off our children and free up capital for private sector investment. I'm really proud of the fact that way over 90 percent of the new jobs created in this recovery were created not by Government but in the private sector. That is exactly what we wanted to happen. So as we reduce the size of Government, the private sector is growing more. We have to do it, but we have to do it consistent with our values and with our interests.

The second thing we have to do is to expand trade. We have our friends here from the Americas. Mack McLarty, who's here with me, worked so hard last December on the Summit of the Americas. And we have worked to follow up on that. We believe that our partners in this hemisphere are a very, very important part of our future. We believe we have to build on NAFTA until we have partnerships with all these democratic governments, to reward their moves to democracy, to freedom, to market economics with a genuine and respectful partnership with the United States.

In that connection, I say I was very well pleased with the remarkable visit I just had with the President of Mexico and the fact that they have already paid back \$700 million of the loan they received through our international financial package ahead of schedule, being faithful to their commitment to modernize Mexico politically and economically.

We have to continue to invest in technology and make it our friend, not our foe. People cannot afford to be afraid of the technological revolution that is sweeping the world. We just have to make sure that everybody can have access to it. And we have to give people the tools they need to succeed.

In that connection, let me say I am very grateful for the support that we've gotten from the business community for every education initiative of our administration, from

expanding Head Start to the Goals 2000 program, which focuses on national standards and grassroots reforms, to the expansion of student loans.

And just a couple of days ago—I know the Secretary of Labor said this earlier, but I want to emphasize this because it achieved almost no public notice, largely because there were only two votes against this bill in the Senate, and when there's no controversy, it is often deemed not important. But with no controversy, a couple of days ago, the United States Senate adopted what I thought was one of the most important new ideas that I advocated in the State of the Union message: the “GI bill for America's workers,” consolidating 70 separate, marginally impacting Federal training programs into a big fund and saying to unemployed people, we will just send you a voucher, we will send you a voucher if you lose your job and you can immediately take it to the nearest community college and begin to start your life again.

Now, that's very important. A lot of you pay a lot of unemployment tax. The unemployment system today is not relevant to the times in which we live. When the unemployment system in America was developed, 85 percent of the people were called back to the jobs they were laid off from. Today, 85 percent of the people who are laid off are never called back to those jobs. If we want people to feel secure about the future, to have a stake in the future, we have to increase their sense of empowerment about it. That's what this “GI bill for America's workers” will do. It's a very important idea, and we ought to stick with it and support it and properly fund it.

Now, let me say something in all candor. To have—if we're going to continue to move forward in a time of change, you have to expect the leadership of the country to do what you have to do in a time of change, and that's to make decisions that are unpopular in the short run because they're right over the long run. Now, I have found as an elected official that everybody is for that in general, but they're against it in particular. And let me just give you some examples of the kind of things I've faced. I bet I've done five things that have made everybody in this room mad

in the last 2½ years, at least five. But I want to give you a few.

When I became President I knew, based on my conversations with Mr. Greenspan, with people in the private markets, with others, that if we could reduce the deficit at least \$500 billion in 5 years, we'd get a big drop in interest rates and a big boom in this economy. I knew that. And I knew, conversely, if we failed to do it that we would continue to lengthen the sluggish economy which I confronted when I took office. So I made up my mind, come hell or high water, we were going to reduce the deficit \$500 billion. In the first week I showed up in Washington, the leaders of the minority in Congress, who are now the majority leader and the Speaker of the House, told me that I would not get one vote for my budget no matter what I did, not a single, solitary vote. The policy was going to be "just say no."

As a consequence, I had to raise your taxes more and cut spending less than I wanted to, which made a lot of you furious. All I know is, we got a huge drop in the interest rates and a big boom in the economy, and most everybody who paid more made more than they paid. And it was the right thing for the United States. It was wrong for them to refuse to cooperate with me, but they were richly rewarded for it later on. But our country is better off because we passed a deficit reduction plan which, over a 7-year period, is about as big as the one we're debating in the Congress today. And that's what got this country going again. And we did it without cutting education or investment in technology or the environment or our future.

I'll give you another example that affects the mayor here. When we were debating the Brady bill to require people to wait 5 days before they got a handgun, and the assault weapons ban, all my political advisers said, "Don't do this; this is crazy." And I said, "Why do you think it's crazy?" And they said, "Because everybody that's against this will vote against everybody who's for it, but all the people that are for it, they'll find some other reason to oppose you."

That's why things don't get done in your country, because organized interests and their intense opposition always overcome the generalized feeling of good will, which is not

manifest in the same intensity of support. But you know what? Last year 40,000 people with criminal records did not get handguns because of the Brady law. And it was the right thing to do.

And I am tired of picking up the newspaper and seeing kids that are honor students in school getting shot down, standing at bus stops, by nuts with assault weapons. And by election time next time, every hunter in my State will know that nobody lost their hunting rifle and it was all a big canard, there was nothing to it. But people are alive today because those decisions were made.

The teenage smoking initiative—the same thing. Same folks came and said, "Oh, don't do this. By the time the tobacco companies get through working on you, they'll convince every tobacco farmer in North Carolina and Tennessee that you're going to drive them in the poorhouse; they all vote against everybody with a "D" behind their name; they will bury you. And everybody in America that agrees with you will find some other reason not to support you. This is dumb politics." Well, it might be. But we studied that issue for 14 months. We found out two companies knew for 30 years what they were doing and kept on doing it and didn't own up to it. We found out that there were still deliberate attempts to advertise to young people. And most important, we found out that 3,000 kids a day start smoking and 1,000 of them are going to die sooner because of it. I don't know what you think a thousand kids a day are worth, but to me, that's the kind of America I want to live in, where another thousand kids a day have longer, better, fuller lives because somebody doesn't sucker-punch them into doing something they shouldn't do while they are still children. So it may be unpopular, but I think it was the right thing to do.

The same thing—something where most of you agree with me, I think—the affirmative action issue. Everybody said, "Oh, you don't need to—you need to be against this; we need to stop this." But there is still racial discrimination in America, folks. When five Federal law enforcement officials can't even get served in Denny's, there's a problem there. And I could give you a lot of other examples.

I don't favor unfair preferences or quotas or reverse discrimination. Our administration has actually joined lawsuits against reverse discrimination in States. But everybody has to be considered in this country. The great meal ticket we've got for the future is that this is the most diverse, big, rich country in the world. Los Angeles County has 150 different racial and ethnic groups in one county. In the global village, it is a manna from heaven. But we have to learn to live together and work together with common values and a common chance to succeed. So we said, let's mend affirmative action, but let's don't end it. And I hope and believe it made it possible for the people who lead large companies in our country to follow the same policies.

I could give you lots of other examples, but you get the idea. When you're going through a period of change like this, you can't even predict what's going to be popular.

Last night we celebrated one year of the restoration of democracy in Haiti. Well, when we threw the dictators out of Haiti, hardly anybody was for it. But it was the right thing to do. You can't let dictators come to the United States and stand in the shadow of the Statue of Liberty and promise they're going to leave and then go home and keep killing people in the street and never even blink an eye. The United States couldn't do that.

When we helped our friends and neighbors in Mexico, most of you probably supported that. But the day I made the decision, there was a poll in the paper that said by 81 to 15 the American people were opposed to that. Half the people in the country who were for it were in the room at the time I decided to do it. *[Laughter]* But it was the right thing to do, because they're our neighbors, because they want to do the right thing, because they have the capacity to grow and become our strong partners and generate opportunities for you and incomes and jobs for America, because our real future here, no matter what happens to the movement toward free trade, is with our friends here in our backyard, in our neighborhood.

So I would ask all of you as people who have to make difficult decisions to expect people who lead your governmental institutions to do the same thing and to be perfectly

willing to be held accountable for the consequences of them.

And that brings me to the budget issue. Let me say what this is not about, this squabble in Washington. It is not—I say again—it is not about balancing the budget. There are two plans to balance the budget, both of which have been blessed as perfectly credible by every neutral observer.

Our plan would, now we know, would balance the budget in 9 years and continue to increase investment in education, research and development, technology, and the environment. It would invest enough in things like the Commerce Department, the State Department, and our aid programs to maintain our world leadership, which is very important. You see what happens when we have a chance to exercise it. It would lengthen the life of the Medicare Trust Fund just as much as the Republican budget. It would slow the rate of medical inflation but not as much as their budget. Why? Because nobody I know in the health care field believes that we can take \$450 billion out of Medicare and Medicaid over the next 7 years, based on what we now know, without causing serious problems to the medical schools of the country, to the children's hospitals of the country, to the ability of the elderly poor to get into nursing homes or their middle class children to have them there and afford to educate their children, and devastating problems to our ability to care for the over 20 percent of America's children who are so poor they qualify for medical assistance under the Medicaid program.

We do have to slow the rate of medical inflation. I've been working at this for 2 years. We do have to bail out the Medicare Trust Fund. But we have to recognize that we have to listen to the people who do this for a living and have some sense of the practical implications of how much we can cut. My budget has a tax cut, but it's smaller than the congressional one. The congressional budget balances the budget in 7 years. It cuts education, research and development, technology, investment in the environment. It drastically cuts back on our ability to exercise world leadership through the Commerce Department, the State Department, and the aid programs. The tax cut they offer is bigger, and

there's a big tax increase on the lower income working poor—a big one.

I think one of our values ought to be to grow the middle class and shrink the under class. I think it's not a very good idea, on the edge of the 21st century, to grow the under class and shrink the middle class. That is not my idea of what kind of country I want my child and her children to grow up in.

So, can we resolve this? You bet we can. Here's the practical thing; this is what I want to ask you to do. There are four or five big issues where there's a lot of money involved. One is, we differ on how much we estimate we'll grow. I picked a conservative figure, 2½ percent, because that's what the economy has grown for the last 25 years. They said, "Oh, no, we're not going to grow that fast." Well, why are we balancing the budget and giving a capital gains tax cut and doing all this stuff if we think we're going to get lower growth than we've had for the last 25 years?

I don't want to argue it either way, but I mean, I think my growth estimate is not a rosy scenario, it is lower than what a lot of you pay for. The blue chip forecast is for a higher economic growth and, therefore, more revenues than I estimate.

Then we are arguing about the rate of medical inflation. Then there's the question of whether we should reassign or redesign and recalculate the amount of inflation in the Consumer Price Index, which determines how much we increase Social Security and retirement. And we're talking about the size of the tax cut.

We can work this out, folks. The only thing I won't do—I will not do this—I will not let balancing the budget serve as a cover for destroying the social compact, for cutting back on education, wrecking the environment, or undermining our obligations to help protect our children and treat our elderly people decently, because it is not necessary to balance the budget.

Now, I don't want you to take my side or theirs on any of these big questions. Here's what I'm asking you to do. What I want is to get together with the Congress and get a budget out that is an honorable compromise that is better than theirs and better than mine. That's the best kind of get-together, where everybody puts their ideas to-

gether and you come out with something that's better than what anybody had. I'm not the source of all wisdom. But I know this: There's not a single one of you looking at the 21st century and the position of your company that would knowingly cut back on research and development or investment in technology or education and training. You wouldn't do it, not if you didn't have to, and we don't have to.

So all I'm asking you to do is to say, just get together, come up with something. If you do it in good faith, it will be better than the President's budget, and it will be better than the Congress' budget. Because when people get together, that's what they do.

I am prepared to make some decisions that I think are right over the long run, and I believe they are. There is no earthly reason why we shouldn't do this. America needs and deserves a balanced budget. America needs and deserves a balanced budget consistent with our values that will give us the kind of world that we would be proud to have our children and our grandchildren and their children grow up in.

This country is doing well, and it's going to do better. And a lot of it is because of what you are doing. And a lot of it is because of what mayors are doing all over the country. And a lot of it is because of what plain old American citizens are doing. We are moving in the right direction. And there is no country on Earth better positioned to do well in the 21st century than the United States of America. And ironically, all we have to do to get there, I believe, is to be faithful to our basic values and what we know is right.

That's a commitment I make to you. And I'm asking you tonight to do what you can, because you have more influence with most of those folks than I do, to make sure that we get together and do this, do it right, do it for America, and do it for the future.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:34 p.m. at the Williamsburg Inn. In his remarks, he referred to Edgar Woolard, chairman and CEO, E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., Inc., and author and journalist Hugh Sidey. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

The President's Radio Address*October 14, 1995*

Good morning. In recent weeks, all of us have had reason to focus on two of the biggest problems facing our country: the problem of continuing racial divisions and the problem of violence in our homes, violence against women and children.

Today, I want to talk to you about that violence in our homes. It is prevalent, unforgivable, and sometimes deadly. In the latest statistics from the Justice Department, we find that close to a third of all women murdered in this country were killed by their husbands, former husbands, or boyfriends.

For too long, domestic violence has been swept under the rug, treated as a private family matter that was nobody's business but those involved. Fortunately, that's changing. In recent years, a huge public outcry against domestic violence has been rising all across the Nation. In our churches, schools, and throughout communities, we've begun to bring this problem out in the open and deal with it. Now everyone knows it is cowardly, destructive of families, immoral, and criminal to abuse the women in our families.

Just last week at the White House, I met with a group of women who are survivors of domestic abuse. One woman told me of being battered and terrorized for more than 20 years, all the while blaming herself for the brutality she endured. It wasn't until her husband attacked her son that she got up the courage to leave the marriage and to seek help.

It's important to remember that when children witness or are victimized by violence in the home, they often later grow up to abuse their own families. So it can become a vicious cycle, as many abusers were once those abused themselves.

The good news is we can do something about this. The same day I met with the women survivors, I also met a remarkable Nashville police sergeant named Mark Wynn, a young man who himself grew up in a home where his father abused his mother and the children. But that experience motivated him to become a police officer and to dedicate his life to preventing domestic violence. For the past 10 years, he's been

educating police nationwide about the seriousness of this problem and what to do about it. And he spearheaded the creation of a special domestic violence unit in the Nashville Police Department that has helped to reduce domestic murders by 70 percent in the last 6 months alone.

One year ago, we made a major commitment in Washington to ensuring the securities of our families with the bipartisan passage of my anticrime bill. That law banned assault weapons from our streets and our schools, imposed tougher penalties for repeat offenders, including the "three strikes and you're out" law. It provided resources for community-based prevention programs to give our children something to say yes to. And it put 100,000 more police officers behind our efforts at effective community policing. That's an increase of about 20 percent in the number of police who are protecting our citizens. In just a year, 25,000 of these new officers are already out there working to help make your life safer. And I've put aside \$20 million to train our police to effectively deal with the problems of domestic violence.

The crime bill also included the landmark Violence Against Women Act. For the first time in our history, the Federal Government is now a full partner in the effort to stop domestic violence. The Violence Against Women Act combines tough new sanctions against abusers with assistance to police, to prosecutors, and to shelters in the fight against domestic violence.

Just last week, we awarded grants to organizations in 16 different States to assist in their efforts to stop the violence and support the victims. And soon we'll establish an 800 number where women facing abuse can get assistance, counseling, and shelter.

Yet at the very moment our Nation has been focused on the abuse against women by their husbands—or former husbands or boyfriends—the House of Representatives has voted to cut \$50 million from our efforts to protect battered women and their children, to preserve families, and to punish these crimes. I'm happy that the Senate agreed with me to fully fund the Violence Against Women Act, and I certainly hope the House will reconsider its decision.

Violence against women within our families will not go away unless we all take responsibility for ending it. So let me close today by speaking directly to the men of America, not just as President or a father or a husband but also as a son who has seen domestic violence firsthand.

We all know how much we owe to the sacrifices of the women who are our mothers, our wives, our sisters, our daughters. I was fortunate enough to be raised by a loving mother who taught me right from wrong and made me believe I could accomplish anything I was willing to work hard for. Hillary and I were blessed to celebrate our 20th wedding anniversary just this week. And of course, our daughter Chelsea is the great joy of our lives.

I know that all of us support stronger law enforcement efforts to deal with violence against all of the mothers, all of the wives, all of the daughters in America. But the real solution to this problem starts with us, with our personal responsibility and a simple pledge that we will never, never lift a hand against a woman for as long as we live and that we will teach our children that violence is never the answer. Then we can do all we can to end violence in our homes, in our neighborhoods, and in everyone else's homes and neighborhoods throughout our beloved country.

Thank you for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 1:48 p.m. on October 13 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on October 14.

**Remarks at the Dedication of the
Thomas J. Dodd Archives and
Research Center in Storrs,
Connecticut**

October 15, 1995

Thank you very much, President Hartley. Governor Rowland; Senator Lieberman, Members of Congress, and distinguished United States Senators and former Senators who have come today; Chairman Rome; members of the Diplomatic Corps; to all of you who have done anything to make this great day come to pass; to my friend and former colleague Governor O'Neill; and most

of all, to Senator Dodd, Ambassador Dodd, and the Dodd family: I am delighted to be here.

I have so many thoughts now. I can't help mentioning one. Since President Hartley mentioned the day we had your magnificent women's basketball team there, we also had the UCLA men's team there. You may not remember who UCLA defeated for the national championship—[laughter]—but I do remember that UConn defeated the University of Tennessee. And that made my life with Al Gore much more bearable. [Laughter] So I was doubly pleased when UConn won the national championship.

I also did not know until it was stated here at the outset of this ceremony that no sitting President had the privilege of coming to the University of Connecticut before, but they don't know what they missed. I'm glad to be the first, and I know I won't be the last.

I also want to pay a special public tribute to the Dodd family for their work on this enterprise and for their devotion to each other and the memory of Senator Thomas Dodd. If, as so many of us believe, this country rests in the end upon its devotion to freedom and liberty and democracy and upon the strength of its families, you could hardly find a better example than the Dodd family, not only for their devotion to liberty and democracy but also for their devotion to family and to the memory of Senator Tom Dodd. It has deeply moved all of us, and we thank you for your example.

Tom Dodd spent his life serving America. He demonstrated an extraordinary commitment to the rule of law, beginning with his early days as an FBI agent, then Federal attorney. He was equally passionate in his opposition to tyranny in all its forms. He fought the tyranny of racism, prosecuting civil rights cases in the South in the 1930's, long before it was popular anywhere in the United States, and helping to shepherd the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964 into law. He fought the tyranny of communism throughout his years in elected office. And while he bowed to none in his devotion to freedom, he also stood bravely against those who wrapped themselves in the flag and turned anticommunism into demagoguery.

Tom Dodd was in so many ways a man ahead of his time. He was passionate about civil rights three decades before the civil rights movement changed the face of our Nation. In the Senate, he pioneered programs to fight delinquency and to give the young people of our country a chance at a good education and a good job. And that is a task, my fellow Americans, we have not yet finished doing. He saw the dangers of guns and drugs on our streets, and he acted to do something about that. Had we done it in his time, we would not have so much work to do in this time.

Tom Dodd's passion for justice and his hatred of oppression came together, as all of you know, most powerfully when he served as America's executive trial counsel at the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal. It was the pivotal event of his life. He helped to bring justice to bear against those responsible for the Holocaust, for the acts that redefined our understanding of man's capacity for evil. Through that pathbreaking work, he and his fellow jurists pushed one step forward the historic effort to bring the crimes of war under the sanction of law.

Senator Dodd left many good works and reminders of his achievement. Some bear his name, the children who have followed in his steps and served the public, who carried forward his ardent support for an American foreign policy that stands for democracy and freedom, who maintain his commitment to social justice, to strong communities and strong families. They have also upheld their father's tradition of loyalty. And as one of the chief beneficiaries of that lesson, let me say that I am grateful for it and again grateful for its expression in this remarkable project which will help the people of Connecticut and the United States to understand their history.

I am delighted that this center will bear the Dodd name because it is fitting that a library, a place that keeps and honors books and records, will honor Tom Dodd's service, his passion for justice, and his hatred of tyranny. Where books are preserved, studied, and revered, human beings will also be treated with respect and dignity and liberty will be strengthened.

Dedicating this research center today, we remember that when the Nazis came to power, one of the very first things they did was burn books they deemed subversive. The road to tyranny, we must never forget, begins with the destruction of the truth.

In the darkest days of the war, President Roosevelt, with those awful bonfires fresh in his memory, reflected upon how the free pursuit of knowledge protects our liberty, and he put it well when he called books "the weapons for man's freedom." I am glad that Tom Dodd will be remembered here, in this place, in this building, with this center, in the State he loved, with the very best arsenal for the freedom he fought to defend his entire life.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:40 p.m. at the University of Connecticut. In his remarks, he referred to Harry Hartley, president, and Lewis Rome, chairman, University of Connecticut; and Gov. John G. Rowland and former Gov. William A. O'Neill of Connecticut.

Remarks at the University of Connecticut in Storrs

October 15, 1995

Thank you very much, first, Senator Dodd, for your dedication and your service, your friendship, and your wonderful, wonderful introduction. It's worth three more strokes the next time we play golf. *[Laughter]* Chairman Rome, President Hartley, Governor Rowland, Senator Lieberman, members of the congressional delegation, and especially your Congressman, Representative Gejdenson, thank you for your fine remarks here today. To the State officials who are here and the Senators and former Members of the United States Senate; to my friend Governor O'Neill and all others who have served this great State; the faculty, students, and friends of the University of Connecticut; and to the remarkable American treasure, Morton Gould, who composed that awesome piece of music we heard just before we started the program.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am delighted to be here. As an old musician, I'd like to begin by congratulating the wind ensemble. They

were quite wonderful in every way, I thought. As a near fanatic basketball fan, I am glad to be in a place where it can truly be said there is no other place in America where both men and women play basketball so well under the same roof. And at the risk of offending the Dodd family and all the other Irish who are here, I want to say that your new football coach, with his remarkable record, learned at his father's knee, not at Notre Dame but when he spent 9 years in my home State as a football coach. *[Laughter]* But congratulations on that great start for the University of Connecticut football team. That is a remarkable thing.

When Governor Rowland made his fine remarks and talked about the Special Olympians turning their cameras around and turning their camera sighting into the telescope, I thought it was a remarkable story. And I was wondering if he could identify them and arrange to send them to Washington for a few weeks—*[laughter]*—so that we might clear vision down there as we make these decisions.

Let me also say just one other thing by way of introduction. The State of Connecticut is really fortunate to have two such remarkable United States Senators, and I am very fortunate to have known both of them a long, long time before I became the President and a long, long time before either one of them thought that was even a remote possibility for the United States. *[Laughter]*

I was a student at Yale Law School and a sometime volunteer when Joe Lieberman first ran for the State senate back in 1970. He still barely looks old enough to be a State senator. *[Laughter]* And I thank him for the remarkable blend of new ideas and common sense and old-fashioned values he brings to the Senate.

And in many, many ways I have enjoyed a long and rich personal friendship with Chris Dodd. I can't add anything to what Senator Lieberman said, but I will say this: At a time when every person in public life talks about family values, it is quite one thing to talk and another thing to do. And I have been very moved by the family values of the Dodd family and what they have done together that has brought this magnificent day

to pass. And I honor them all and especially my friend Senator Chris Dodd.

I have been asked today to inaugurate the first Dodd center symposium on the topic of "50 Years After Nuremberg." I am honored to do that. I was born just after World War II, and I grew up as a part of a generation of young students who were literally fascinated by every aspect of the Nuremberg trials and what their ramifications were and were not for every unfolding event in the world that was disturbing to human conscience.

I wish that Tom Dodd could be here today to see this center take life, not only because of what his family and friends and this State have done but because now, for all time, we will be able to study this great question as we strive to overcome human evil and human failing to be better.

Senator Dodd, as we know, was a man of extraordinary breadth and depth, who was passionate about civil rights three decades before the civil rights movement changed the face of our Nation; who fought to provide the young people of America with an education and a decent job, a fight that is never-ending; who understood then the menace of violence and guns and drugs on the streets of our cities. And if only others had joined him firmly then, think what we might have avoided today.

But most important, we look today at his experience at Nuremberg as a prosecutor, an experience that compelled him for the rest of his life to stand up for freedom and human dignity all around the world. He made a great deal of difference. And now, because his spirit lives on in the Dodd center, he will be able to make a difference forever.

A few moments ago, in the powerful documentary we watched on Nuremberg, our chief prosecutor, Mr. Justice Jackson's words spoke to us across three decades: "The wrongs which we seek to condemn and punish have been so calculated, so malignant, and so devastating, that civilization cannot tolerate their being ignored because it cannot survive their being repeated."

At Nuremberg, the international community declared that those responsible for crimes against humanity will be held accountable without the usual defenses af-

forded to people in times of war. The very existence of the Tribunal was a triumph for justice and for humanity and for the proposition that there must be limits even in wartime. Flush with victory, outraged by the evil of the Nazi death camps, the Allies easily could have simply lashed out in revenge. But the terrible struggle of World War II was a struggle for the very soul of humankind. To deny its oppressors the rights they had stripped from their victims would have been to win the war but to lose the larger struggle. The Allies understood that the only answer to inhumanity is justice. And as Senator Dodd said, three of the defendants were actually acquitted, even in that tumultuous, passionate environment.

In the years since Nuremberg, the hope that convicting those guilty of making aggressive war would deter future wars and prevent future crimes against humanity, including genocide, frankly, has gone unfulfilled too often. From 1945 until the present day, wars between and within nations, including practices which were found to be illegal at Nuremberg, have cost more than 20 million lives. The wrongs Justice Jackson hoped Nuremberg would end have not been repeated on the scale of Nazi Germany, in the way that they did it, but they have been repeated and repeated on a scale that still staggers the imagination.

Still, Nuremberg was a crucial first step. It rendered a clear verdict on atrocities. It placed human rights on a higher ground. It set a timeless precedent by stripping away convenient excuses for abominable conduct. Now it falls to our generation to make good on its promise: to put into practice the principle that those who violate universal human rights must be called to account for those actions.

This mission demands the abiding commitment of all people. And like many of the other challenges of our time, it requires the power of our Nation's example and the strength of our leadership, first, because America was founded on the proposition that all God's children have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These are values that define us as a nation, but they are not unique to our experience. All over the world, from Russia to South Africa, from

Poland to Cambodia, people have been willing to fight and to die for them.

Second, we have to do it because, while fascism and communism are dead or discredited, the forces of hatred and intolerance live on as they will for as long as human beings are permitted to exist on this planet Earth. Today, it is ethnic violence, religious strife, terrorism. These threats confront our generation in a way that still would spread darkness over light, disintegration over integration, chaos over community. Our purpose is to fight them, to defeat them, to support and sustain the powerful worldwide aspirations of democracy, dignity, and freedom.

And finally, we must do it because, in the aftermath of the cold war, we are the world's only superpower. We have to do it because while we seek to do everything we possibly can in the world in cooperation with other nations, they find it difficult to proceed in cooperation if we are not there as a partner and very often as a leader.

With our purpose and with our position comes the responsibility to help shine the light of justice on those who would deny to others their most basic human rights. We have an obligation to carry forward the lessons of Nuremberg. That is why we strongly support the United Nations War Crimes Tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda.

The goals of these tribunals are straightforward: to punish those responsible for genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity; to deter future such crimes; and to help nations that were torn apart by violence begin the process of healing and reconciliation.

The tribunal for the former Yugoslavia has made excellent progress. It has collected volumes of evidence of atrocities, including the establishment of death camps, mass executions, and systematic campaigns of rape and terror. This evidence is the basis for the indictments the tribunal already has issued against 43 separate individuals. And this week, 10 witnesses gave dramatic, compelling testimony against one of the indictees in a public proceeding. These indictments are not negotiable. Those accused of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide must be brought to justice. They must

be tried and, if found guilty, they must be held accountable. Some people are concerned that pursuing peace in Bosnia and prosecuting war criminals are incompatible goals. But I believe they are wrong. There must be peace for justice to prevail, but there must be justice when peace prevails.

In recent weeks, the combination of American leadership, NATO's resolve, the international community's diplomatic determination: these elements have brought us closer to a settlement in Bosnia than at any time since the war began there 4 years ago. So let me repeat again what I have said consistently for over 2 years: If and when the parties do make peace, the United States, through NATO, must help to secure it.

Only NATO can strongly and effectively implement a settlement. And the United States, as NATO's leader, must do its part and join our troops to those of our allies in such an operation. If you were moved by the film we saw and you believe that it carries lessons for the present day and you accept the fact that not only our values but our position as the world's only superpower impose upon us an obligation to carry through, then the conclusion is inevitable: We must help to secure a peace if a peace can be reached in Bosnia. We will not send our troops into combat. We will not ask them to keep a peace that cannot be maintained. But we must use our power to secure a peace and to implement the agreement.

We have an opportunity and a responsibility to help resolve this, the most difficult security challenge in the heart of Europe since World War II. When His Holiness the Pope was here just a few days ago, we spent a little over a half an hour alone, and we talked of many things. But in the end, he said, "Mr. President, I am not a young man. I have a long memory. This century began with a war in Sarajevo. We must not let this century end with a war in Sarajevo."

Even if a peace agreement is reached, and I hope that we can do that, no peace will endure for long without justice. For only justice can break finally the cycle of violence and retribution that fuels war and crimes against humanity. Only justice can lift the burden of collective guilt. It weighs upon a society where unspeakable acts of destruc-

tion have occurred. Only justice can assign responsibility to the guilty and allow everyone else to get on with the hard work of rebuilding and reconciliation. So as the United States leads the international effort to forge a lasting peace in Bosnia, the War Crimes Tribunal must carry on its work to find justice.

The United States is contributing more than \$16 million in funds and services to that tribunal and to the one regarding Rwanda. We have 20 prosecutors, investigators, and other personnel on the staffs. And at the United Nations, we have led the effort to secure adequate funding for these tribunals. And we continue to press others to make voluntary contributions. We do this because we believe doing it is part of acting on the lessons that Senator Dodd and others taught us at Nuremberg.

By successfully prosecuting war criminals in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, we can send a strong signal to those who would use the cover of war to commit terrible atrocities that they cannot escape the consequences of such actions. And a signal will come across even more loudly and clearly if nations all around the world who value freedom and tolerance establish a permanent international court to prosecute, with the support of the United Nations Security Council, serious violations of humanitarian law. This, it seems to me, would be the ultimate tribute to the people who did such important work at Nuremberg, a permanent international court to prosecute such violations. And we are working today at the United Nations to see whether it can be done.

But my fellow Americans and my fellow citizens of the world, let me also say that our commitment to punish these crimes against humanity must be matched by our commitment to prevent them in the first place. As we work to support these tribunals, let's not forget what our ultimate goal is. Our ultimate goal must be to render them completely obsolete because such things no longer occur.

Accountability is a powerful deterrent, but it isn't enough. It doesn't get to the root cause of such atrocities. Only a profound change in the nature of societies can begin to reach the heart of the matter. And I be-

lieve the basis of that profound change is democracy.

Democracy is the best guarantor of human rights—not a perfect one, to be sure; you can see that in the history of the United States—but it is still the system that demands respect for the individual, and it requires responsibility from the individual to thrive. Democracy cannot eliminate all violations of human rights or outlaw human frailty, nor does promoting democracy relieve us of the obligation to press others who do not operate democracies to respect human rights. But more than any other system of government we know, democracy protects those rights, defends the victims of their abuse, punishes the perpetrators, and prevents a downward spiral of revenge.

So promoting democracy does more than advance our ideals. It reinforces our interests. Where the rule of law prevails, where governments are held accountable, where ideas and information flow freely, economic development and political stability are more likely to take hold and human rights are more likely to thrive. History teaches us that democracies are less likely to go to war, less likely to traffic in terrorism and more likely to stand against the forces of hatred and destruction, more likely to become good partners in diplomacy and trade. So promoting democracy and defending human rights is good for the world and good for America.

These aims have always had a powerful advocate in Senator Chris Dodd, who has defended the vulnerable and championed democracy, especially here in our own hemisphere, as has his brother, Tom, first as a distinguished academic at our common alma mater, Georgetown, and then as America's Ambassador to Uruguay. As a Peace Corps volunteer in the Dominican Republic, Senator Dodd helped some of our poorest neighbors to build homes for their families. Twenty-five years later, when a brutal dictatorship overthrew the legitimate government of Haiti, murdering, mutilating, and raping thousands and causing tens of thousands more to flee in fear, Chris Dodd was the conscience of the Senate on Haiti. He urged America and the world to take action.

On this very day one year ago, an American-led multinational force returned the

duly elected President of Haiti, Jean Bertrand Aristide, to his country. The anniversary we celebrate today was the culmination of a 3-year effort by the United States and the international community to remove the dictators and restore democracy. Because we backed diplomacy with the force of our military, the dictators finally did step down. And Haiti's democrats stepped back into their rightful place.

Our actions ended a reign of terror that did violence not only to innocent Haitians but to the values and the principles of the civilized world. We renewed hope in Haiti's future where once there was only despair. We upheld the reliability of our own commitments and the commitments that others make to us. We sent a powerful message to the would-be despots in the region: Democracy in the Americas cannot be overthrown with impunity.

We have seen extraordinary progress in this year. The democratic government has been restored. Human rights are its purpose, not its disgrace. Violence has subsided, though not ended altogether. Peaceful elections have occurred. Reform is underway. A new civilian police force has already more than 1,000 officers on the street. A growing private sector is beginning to generate jobs and opportunity. After so much blood and terror, the people of Haiti have resumed their long journey to security and prosperity with dignity.

There is a lot of work to do. Haiti is still the poorest nation in our hemisphere, and that is a breeding ground for the things we all come here to condemn today. Its democratic institutions are fragile, and all those years of vicious oppression have left scars and some still thirsting for revenge.

For reform to take root and to endure, trust must be fully established not only between the Government and the people but among the people of Haiti themselves. President Aristide understands that when he says, no to violence, yes to justice; no to vengeance, yes to reconciliation.

This is very important. Assigning individual responsibilities for crimes of the past is also important there. Haiti now has a national commission for truth and justice, launching investigations of past human rights abuses.

And with our support, Haiti is improving the effectiveness, accessibility, and accountability of its own justice system, again, to prevent future violations as well as to punish those which occur.

The people of Haiti know it's up to them to safeguard their freedom. But we know, as President Kennedy said, that democracy is never a final achievement. And just as the American people, after 200 years, are continually struggling to perfect our own democracy, we must and we will stand with the people of Haiti as they struggle to build their own. Indeed, the Vice President is just today in Haiti celebrating the one-year anniversary.

And let me say one final thing about this. I thank Senator Dodd and Ambassador Dodd for their concern with freedom, democracy, and getting rid of the horrible human rights abuses that have occurred in the past throughout the Americas. The First Lady is in South America today—or she would be here with me—partly because of the path that has been blazed by the Dodd family in this generation to stand up for democracy, so that every single country of the Americas, save one, now has a democratically elected leader. And human rights abuses and the kinds of crimes that Senator Thomas Dodd stood up against at Nuremberg are dramatically, dramatically reduced because of that process and this family's leadership.

In closing, let me say that, for all of the work we might do through tribunals to bring the guilty to account, it is our daily commitment to the ideals of human dignity, democracy, and peace that has been and will continue to be the source of our strength in the world and our capacity to work with others to prevent such terrible things from occurring in the first place.

We will continue to defend the values we believe make life worth living. We will continue to defend the proposition that all people, without regard to their nationality, their race, their ethnic group, their religion, their gender, should have the chance to live free, should have the chance to make the most of their God-given potential. For too long, all across the globe, women and their children, in particular, were denied these human rights. Those were the rights for which the First Lady spoke so forcefully in China at

the Women's Conference and for which the United States will work hard in the years ahead.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are living in a moment of great hope and possibility. The capacity of the United States to lead has been energized by our ability to succeed economically in the global economy and by the efforts we are making to come to grips with our own problems here at home. But I leave you with this thought that was referred to by the Governor in his fine remarks and that the president of this University has emphasized in his comments today.

It is important that we be able to act upon our values. And what enables us to do it is our success as a nation, our strength as a people, the fact that people can see that if you live as we say we should live, that people can work together across racial and ethnic and other divides to create one from many, as our motto says, and to do well.

Therefore, we should in the weeks ahead in Washington find a way to come together across our political divide to balance the budget after the deficit has taken such a toll on our economy over the last dozen years. But I ask you to remember this: We must do it in a way that is consistent with our values and with our ability to live by and implement and support those values here at home and all around the world.

Therefore, if our goal is to preserve our ideals and our dreams and our leadership and to extend them to all Americans, when we balance the budget we must not turn our backs on our obligation to give all Americans a chance to get an education, including a college education; to honor our fathers and our mothers in terms of how we treat their legitimate needs which they have earned the right to have addressed, including their health care needs; and not to forget the poor children, even though it is unfashionable to talk about poverty in this world today. They will be the adults of this country someday.

We are strong because we honor each other across the generations. We are strong when we reach across the racial and ethnic divides. We are strong when we continue to invest in education and the technology which opens all the mysterious doors of the future. We are strong when we preserve the environ-

ment that God gave us here at home and around our increasingly interconnected planet. We are strong when we continue to determine to lead the world.

These are the things which make it possible for us to meet here in Connecticut today and advocate the responsibility of the United States to lead in the protection of human rights around the world and the prevention of future horrendous circumstances such as those that Senator Dodd had to address at Nuremberg.

So I ask you to remember those lessons, as well. If we have an obligation to stand up for what is right, to advance what is right, to lift up human potential, we must be able to fulfill that obligation.

If there is one last lesson of this day, I believe it should be that prosperity for the United States is not the most important thing and not an end in itself. We should seek it only, only, as a means to enhance the human spirit, to enhance human dignity, to enhance the ability of every person in our country and those whom we have the means to help around the world to become the people God meant for them to be. If we can remember that, then we can be faithful to the generation that won World War II, to the outstanding leaders which established the important precedents at Nuremberg, and to the mission and the spirit of the Dodd Center.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:18 p.m. at Gampel Pavilion.

Proclamation 6841—National Character Counts Week, 1995

October 14, 1995

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

The children of today will be tomorrow's leaders, educators, caregivers, and parents. As we seek to prepare our Nation for the challenges of the future, we must reaffirm America's deepest beliefs and instill in our youth the principles of opportunity, responsibility, and community that have always united our citizens. Emphasizing both individual

and social duties, character education helps us toward that goal and reminds us that our country's strength has long been drawn from fundamental ideas.

Families have always held the primary obligation for teaching values to their children. Schools, too, play a vital role in reinforcing the basic precepts of good citizenship—fairness and honesty, respect for oneself and for others, and personal accountability. My Administration's education agenda is dedicated to raising standards for academics and discipline so that young people will have the essential tools they need to succeed. Our Goals 2000: Educate America Act embraces the importance of parental involvement in the learning process, recognizing that family participation encourages children to value scholarship and to adopt strong values. Character education programs can increase school performance as well, and the Improving America's Schools Act promotes such initiatives.

As Americans, we are called upon to fulfill the obligations of citizenship in many ways. As our Nation observes this special week, let us remember our responsibilities to children and do everything in our power to inspire in them the moral and ethical standards that will, in turn, help them to become productive, integral members of our society.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim October 15 through October 21, 1995, as National Character Counts Week. I call upon government officials; educators; religious, community, and business leaders; and all the people of the United States to work for the preservation of traditional values and to commemorate this week with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fourteenth day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twentieth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:38 a.m., October 17, 1995]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 16, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on October 18.

Proclamation 6842—National Forest Products Week, 1995

October 14, 1995

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

America's forests are a priceless inheritance—one of our country's greatest treasures. From National Forests to State and local parks, from industrial timberlands to privately-owned lots, wooded areas offer us numerous gifts and promise future generations continued benefits. During National Forest Products Week, we renew our commitment to care for our woodlands and to preserve their capacity to sustain themselves.

Providing nutrients and habitat to countless species—including those threatened or endangered—our Nation's forests extend their bounty to mankind as well. Many Americans depend on timberlands for their livelihood; countless people enjoy camping, hiking, and picnicking; and others seek out the woods to find peace and spiritual renewal. In addition, these rich tracts of land produce raw materials for building and other uses and are an essential source of food and medicines derived from trees, shrubs, forbs, fungi, and micro-organisms.

The current state of our forests requires our government, citizens, and the forestry industry to examine past and current forest management practices and to develop new strategies. We are moving toward a new era in stewardship with increased emphasis on forests that are diverse, robust, productive, and sustainable. Understanding that our wooded regions are part of a global mosaic of ecosystems, we must continue to promote public and private environmental responsibility and ensure that our conservation efforts set standards for the world to follow.

In recognition of the central importance of our forests to the welfare of our Nation,

the Congress, by Public Law 86-753 (36 U.S.C. 163), has designated the week beginning on the third Sunday in October of each year as "National Forest Products Week" and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this week.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim October 15 through October 21, 1995, as National Forest Products Week. I call upon the people of the United States to honor the vital role America's forests play in our national life and to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fourteenth day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twentieth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:37 a.m., October 17, 1995]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 16, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on October 18.

Remarks at the University of Texas at Austin

October 16, 1995

Thank you. You know, when I was a boy growing up in Arkansas, I thought it highly—[*applause*—I thought it highly unlikely that I would ever become President of the United States. Perhaps the only thing even more unlikely was that I should ever have the opportunity to be cheered at the University of Texas. I must say I am very grateful for both of them. [*Laughter*]

President Berdahl, Chancellor Cunningham, Dean Olson; to the Texas Longhorn Band, thank you for playing "Hail to the Chief." You were magnificent. To my longtime friend of nearly 25 years now, Bernard Rapoport, thank you for your statement and your inspiration and your life of generous giving to this great university and so many

other good causes. All the distinguished guests in the audience—I hesitate to start, but I thank my friend and your fellow Texan Henry Cisneros for coming down here with me and for his magnificent work as Secretary of HUD. I thank your Congressman, Lloyd Doggett, and his wife, Libby, for flying down with me. And I'm glad to see my dear friend Congressman Jake Pickle here; I miss you. Your attorney general, Dan Morales; the land commissioner, Garry Mauro, I thank all of them for being here. Thank you, Luci Johnson, for being here, and please give my regards to your wonderful mother. I have not seen her here—there she is. And I have to recognize and thank your former Congresswoman and now distinguished professor, Barbara Jordan, for the magnificent job you did on the immigration issue. Thank you so much. *[Applause]* Thank you. Thank you.

My wife told me about coming here so much, I wanted to come and see for myself. I also know, as all of you do, that there is no such thing as saying no to Liz Carpenter. *[Laughter]* I drug it out as long as I could just to hear a few more jokes. *[Laughter]*

My fellow Americans, I want to begin by telling you that I am hopeful about America. When I looked at Nikole Bell up here introducing me and I shook hands with these other young students, I looked into their eyes, I saw the AmeriCorps button on that gentleman's shirt, I was reminded, as I talk about this thorny subject of race today, I was reminded of what Winston Churchill said about the United States when President Roosevelt was trying to pass the Lend-Lease Act so that we could help Britain in their war against Nazi Germany before we, ourselves, were involved. And for a good while the issue was hanging fire, and it was unclear whether the Congress would permit us to help Britain, who at that time was the only bulwark against tyranny in Europe. And Winston Churchill said, "I have great confidence in the judgment and the common sense of the American people and their leaders. They invariably do the right thing after they have examined every other alternative." *[Laughter]* So I say to you, let me begin by saying that I can see in the eyes of these students and in the spirit of this moment, we will do the right thing.

In recent weeks, every one of us has been made aware of a simple truth: White Americans and black Americans often see the same world in drastically different ways, ways that go beyond and beneath the Simpson trial and its aftermath, which brought these perceptions so starkly into the open.

The rift we see before us that is tearing at the heart of America exists in spite of the remarkable progress black Americans have made in the last generation, since Martin Luther King swept America up in his dream and President Johnson spoke so powerfully for the dignity of man and the destiny of democracy in demanding that Congress guarantee full voting rights to blacks. The rift between blacks and whites exists still in a very special way in America, in spite of the fact that we have become much more racially and ethnically diverse and that Hispanic-Americans, themselves no strangers to discrimination, are now almost 10 percent of our national population.

The reasons for this divide are many. Some are rooted in the awful history and stubborn persistence of racism. Some are rooted in the different ways we experience the threats of modern life to personal security, family values, and strong communities. Some are rooted in the fact that we still haven't learned to talk frankly, to listen carefully, and to work together across racial lines.

Almost 30 years ago, Dr. Martin Luther King took his last march with sanitation workers in Memphis. They marched for dignity, equality, and economic justice. Many carried placards that read simply, "I am a man." The throngs of men marching in Washington today, almost all of them, are doing so for the same stated reason. But there is a profound difference between this march today and those of 30 years ago. Thirty years ago, the marchers were demanding the dignity and opportunity they were due because in the face of terrible discrimination, they had worked hard, raised their children, paid their taxes, obeyed the laws, and fought our wars.

Well, today's march is also about pride and dignity and respect. But after a generation of deepening social problems that disproportionately impact black Americans, it is also about black men taking renewed responsibility

ity for themselves, their families, and their communities. It's about saying no to crime and drugs and violence. It's about standing up for atonement and reconciliation. It's about insisting that others do the same and offering to help them. It's about the frank admission that unless black men shoulder their load, no one else can help them or their brothers, their sisters, and their children escape the hard, bleak lives that too many of them still face.

Of course, some of those in the march do have a history that is far from its message of atonement and reconciliation. One million men are right to be standing up for personal responsibility. But one million men do not make right one man's message of malice and division. No good house was ever built on a bad foundation. Nothing good ever came of hate. So let us pray today that all who march and all who speak will stand for atonement, for reconciliation, for responsibility. Let us pray that those who have spoken for hatred and division in the past will turn away from that past and give voice to the true message of those ordinary Americans who march. If that happens, the men and the women who are there with them will be marching into better lives for themselves and their families. And they could be marching into a better future for America.

Today we face a choice. One way leads to further separation and bitterness and more lost futures. The other way, the path of courage and wisdom, leads to unity, to reconciliation, to a rich opportunity for all Americans to make the most of the lives God gave them. This moment in which the racial divide is so clearly out in the open need not be a setback for us. It presents us with a great opportunity, and we dare not let it pass us by.

In the past, when we've had the courage to face the truth about our failure to live up to our own best ideals, we've grown stronger, moved forward, and restored proud American optimism. At such turning points, America moved to preserve the Union and abolish slavery, to embrace women's suffrage, to guarantee basic legal rights to America without regard to race, under the leadership of President Johnson. At each of these moments, we looked in the national mirror and

were brave enough to say, this is not who we are; we're better than that.

Abraham Lincoln reminded us that a house divided against itself cannot stand. When divisions have threatened to bring our house down, somehow we have always moved together to shore it up. My fellow Americans, our house is the greatest democracy in all human history. And with all its racial and ethnic diversity, it has beaten the odds of human history. But we know that divisions remain, and we still have work to do.

The two worlds we see now each contain both truth and distortion. Both black and white Americans must face this, for honesty is the only gateway to the many acts of reconciliation that will unite our worlds at last into one America.

White America must understand and acknowledge the roots of black pain. It began with unequal treatment, first in law and later in fact. African-Americans indeed have lived too long with a justice system that in too many cases has been and continues to be less than just. The record of abuses extends from lynchings and trumped up charges to false arrests and police brutality. The tragedies of Emmett Till and Rodney King are bloody markers on the very same road. Still today, too many of our police officers play by the rules of the bad old days. It is beyond wrong when law-abiding black parents have to tell their law-abiding children to fear the police whose salaries are paid by their own taxes.

And blacks are right to think something is terribly wrong when African-American men are many times more likely to be victims of homicide than any other group in this country, when there are more African-American men in our corrections system than in our colleges, when almost one in three African-American men in their 20's are either in jail, on parole, or otherwise under the supervision of the criminal justice system, nearly one in three. And that is a disproportionate percentage in comparison to the percentage of blacks who use drugs in our society. Now, I would like every white person here and in America to take a moment to think how he or she would feel if one in three white men were in similar circumstances.

And there is still unacceptable economic disparity between blacks and whites. It is so fashionable to talk today about African-Americans as if they have been some sort of protected class. Many whites think blacks are getting more than their fair share in terms of jobs and promotions. That is not true. That is not true.

The truth is that African-Americans still make on average about 60 percent of what white people do, that more than half of African-American children live in poverty. And at the very time our young Americans need access to college more than ever before, black college enrollment is dropping in America.

On the other hand, blacks must understand and acknowledge the roots of white fear in America. There is a legitimate fear of the violence that is too prevalent in our urban areas. And often, by experience or at least what people see on the news at night, violence for those white people too often has a black face.

It isn't racist for a parent to pull his or her child close when walking through a high-crime neighborhood or to wish to stay away from neighborhoods where innocent children can be shot in school or standing at bus stops by thugs driving by with assault weapons or toting handguns like Old West desperadoes. It isn't racist for parents to recoil in disgust when they read about a national survey of gang members saying that two-thirds of them feel justified in shooting someone simply for showing them disrespect. It isn't racist for whites to say they don't understand why people put up with gangs on the corner or in the projects or with drugs being sold in the schools or in the open. It's not racist for whites to assert that the culture of welfare dependency, out-of-wedlock pregnancy, and absent fatherhood cannot be broken by social programs unless there is first more personal responsibility.

The great potential for this march today, beyond the black community, is that whites will come to see a larger truth: that blacks share their fears and embrace their convictions, openly assert that without changes in the black community and within individuals, real change for our society will not come.

This march could remind white people that most black people share their old-fashioned American values, for most black Americans still do work hard, care for their families, pay their taxes, and obey the law, often under circumstances which are far more difficult than those their white counterparts face. Imagine how you would feel if you were a young parent in your 20's with a young child living in a housing project, working somewhere for \$5 an hour with no health insurance, passing every day people on the street selling drugs, making 100 times what you make. Those people are the real heroes of America today, and we should recognize that.

And white people too often forget that they are not immune to the problems black Americans face, crime, drugs, domestic abuse, and teen pregnancy. They are too prevalent among whites as well, and some of those problems are growing faster in our white population than in our minority population.

So we all have a stake in solving these common problems together. It is therefore wrong for white Americans to do what they have done too often, simply to move further away from the problems and support policies that will only make them worse.

Finally, both sides seem to fear deep down inside that they'll never quite be able to see each other as more than enemy faces, all of whom carry at least a sliver of bigotry in their hearts. Differences of opinion rooted in different experiences are healthy, indeed essential, for democracies. But differences so great and so rooted in race threaten to divide the house Mr. Lincoln gave his life to save. As Dr. King said, "We must learn to live together as brothers, or we will perish as fools."

Recognizing one another's real grievances is only the first step. We must all take responsibility for ourselves, our conduct, and our attitudes. America, we must clean our house of racism.

To our white citizens, I say, I know most of you every day do your very best by your own lights to live a life free of discrimination. Nevertheless, too many destructive ideas are gaining currency in our midst. The taped voice of one policeman should fill you with outrage. And so I say, we must clean the

house of white America of racism. Americans who are in the white majority should be proud to stand up and be heard denouncing the sort of racist rhetoric we heard on that tape, so loudly and clearly denouncing it that our black fellow citizens can hear us. White racism may be black people's burden, but it's white people's problem. We must clean our house.

To our black citizens, I honor the presence of hundreds of thousands of men in Washington today committed to atonement and to personal responsibility and the commitment of millions of other men and women who are African-Americans to this cause. I call upon you to build on this effort, to share equally in the promise of America. But to do that, your house, too, must be cleaned of racism. There are too many today, white and black, on the left and the right, on the street corners and the radio waves, who seek to sow division for their own purposes. To them I say, no more. We must be one.

Long before we were so diverse, our Nation's motto was *E pluribus unum*, out of many, we are one. We must be one, as neighbors, as fellow citizens, not separate camps but family, white, black, Latino, all of us, no matter how different, who share basic American values and are willing to live by them.

When a child is gunned down on a street in the Bronx, no matter what our race, he is our American child. When a woman dies from a beating, no matter what our race or hers, she is our American sister. And every time drugs course through the vein of another child, it clouds the future of all our American children. Whether we like it or not, we are one nation, one family, indivisible. And for us, divorce or separation are not options.

Here in 1995, on the edge of the 21st century, we dare not tolerate the existence of two Americas. Under my watch, I will do everything I can to see that as soon as possible there is only one, one America under the rule of law, one social contract committed not to winner take all but to giving all Americans a chance to win together, one America.

Well, how do we get there? First, today I ask every Governor, every mayor, every business leader, every church leader, every civic leader, every union steward, every stu-

dent leader, most important, every citizen, in every workplace and learning place and meeting place all across America to take personal responsibility for reaching out to people of different races, for taking time to sit down and talk through this issue, to have the courage to speak honestly and frankly, and then to have the discipline to listen quietly with an open mind and an open heart, as others do the same.

This may seem like a simple request, but for tens of millions of Americans, this has never been a reality. They have never spoken, and they have never listened, not really, not really. I am convinced, based on a rich lifetime of friendships and common endeavors with people of different races, that the American people will find out they have a lot more in common than they think they do.

The second thing we have to do is to defend and enhance real opportunity. I'm not talking about opportunity for black Americans or opportunity for white Americans; I'm talking about opportunity for all Americans. Sooner or later, all our speaking, all our listening, all our caring has to lead to constructive action together for our words and our intentions to have meaning. We can do this first by truly rewarding work and family in Government policies, in employment policies, in community practices.

We also have to realize that there are some areas of our country, whether in urban areas or poor rural areas like south Texas or eastern Arkansas, where these problems are going to be more prevalent just because there is no opportunity. There is only so much temptation some people can stand when they turn up against a brick wall day after day after day. And if we can spread the benefits of education and free enterprise to those who have been denied them too long and who are isolated in enclaves in this country, then we have a moral obligation to do it. It will be good for our country.

Third and perhaps most important of all, we have to give every child in this country, and every adult who still needs it, the opportunity to get a good education. President Johnson understood that, and now that I am privileged to have this job and to look back across the whole sweep of American history,

I can appreciate how truly historic his commitment to the simple idea that every child in this country ought to have an opportunity to get a good, safe, decent, fulfilling education was. It was revolutionary then, and it is revolutionary today.

Today that matters more than ever. I'm trying to do my part. I am fighting hard against efforts to roll back family security, aid to distressed communities, and support for education. I want it to be easier for poor children to get off to a good start in school, not harder. I want it to be easier for everybody to go to college and stay there, not harder. I want to mend affirmative action, but I do not think America is at a place today where we can end it. The evidence of the last several weeks shows that.

But let us remember, the people marching in Washington today are right about one fundamental thing: At its base, this issue of race is not about government or political leaders, it is about what is in the heart and minds and life of the American people. There will be no progress in the absence of real responsibility on the part of all Americans. Nowhere is that responsibility more important than in our efforts to promote public safety and preserve the rule of law.

Law and order is the first responsibility of government. Our citizens must respect the law and those who enforce it. Police have a life-and-death responsibility never, never to abuse the power granted them by the people. We know, by the way, what works in fighting crime also happens to improve relationships between the races. What works in fighting crime is community policing. We have seen it working all across America. The crime rate is down, the murder rate is down where people relate to each other across the lines of police and community in an open, honest, respectful, supportive way. We can lower crime and raise the state of race relations in America if we will remember this simple truth.

But if this is going to work, police departments have to be fair and engaged with, not estranged from, their communities. I am committed to making this kind of community policing a reality all across our country. But you must be committed to making it a reality in your communities. We have to root out

the remnants of racism in our police departments. We've got to get it out of our entire criminal justice system. But just as the police have a sacred duty to protect the community fairly, all of our citizens have a sacred responsibility to respect the police, to teach our young people to respect them, and then to support them and work with them so that they can succeed in making us safer.

Let's not forget, most police officers of whatever race are honest people who love the law and put their lives on the lines so that the citizens they're protecting can lead decent, secure lives and so that their children can grow up to do the same.

Finally, I want to say, on the day of this march, a moment about a crucial area of responsibility, the responsibility of fatherhood. The single biggest social problem in our society may be the growing absence of fathers from their children's homes, because it contributes to so many other social problems. One child in four grows up in a fatherless home. Without a father to help guide, without a father to care, without a father to teach boys to be men and to teach girls to expect respect from men, it's harder. There are a lot of mothers out there doing a magnificent job alone, a magnificent job alone, but it is harder. It is harder. This, of course, is not a black problem or a Latino problem or a white problem, it is an American problem. But it aggravates the conditions of the racial divide.

I know from my own life it is harder, because my own father died before I was born, and my stepfather's battle with alcohol kept him from being the father he might have been. But for all fathers, parenting is not easy, and every parent makes mistakes. I know that, too, from my own experience. The point is that we need people to be there for their children day after day. Building a family is the hardest job a man can do, but it's also the most important.

For those who are neglecting their children, I say it is not too late; your children still need you. To those who only send money in the form of child support, I say keep sending the checks; your kids count on them, and we'll catch you and enforce the law if you stop. But the message of this march today—one message is that your money is no replace-

ment for your guiding, your caring, your loving the children you brought into this world.

We can only build strong families when men and women respect each other, when they have partnerships, when men are as involved in the homeplace as women have become involved in the workplace. It means, among other things, that we must keep working until we end domestic violence against women and children. I hope those men in Washington today pledge among other things to never, never raise their hand in violence against a woman.

So today, my fellow Americans, I honor the black men marching in Washington to demonstrate their commitment to themselves, their families, and their communities. I honor the millions of men and women in America, the vast majority of every color, who without fanfare or recognition do what it takes to be good fathers and good mothers, good workers and good citizens. They all deserve the thanks of America.

But when we leave here today, what are you going to do? What are you going to do? Let all of us who want to stand up against racism do our part to roll back the divide. Begin by seeking out people in the workplace, the classroom, the community, the neighborhood across town, the places of worship to actually sit down and have those honest conversations I talked about, conversations where we speak openly and listen and understand how others view this world of ours.

Make no mistake about it, we can bridge this great divide. This is, after all, a very great country. And we have become great by what we have overcome. We have the world's strongest economy, and it's on the move. But we've really lasted because we have understood that our success could never be measured solely by the size of our gross national product.

I believe the march in Washington today spawned such an outpouring because it is a reflection of something deeper and stronger that is running throughout our American community. I believe that in millions and millions of different ways, our entire country is reasserting our commitment to the bedrock values that made our country great and that make life worth living.

The great divides of the past called for and were addressed by legal and legislative changes. They were addressed by leaders like Lyndon Johnson, who passed the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act. And to be sure, this great divide requires a public response by democratically elected leaders. But today, we are really dealing, and we know it, with problems that grow in large measure out of the way all of us look at the world with our minds and the way we feel about the world with our hearts.

And therefore, while leaders and legislation may be important, this is work that has to be done by every single one of you. And this is the ultimate test of our democracy, for today the house divided exists largely in the minds and hearts of the American people. And it must be united there, in the minds and hearts of our people.

Yes, there are some who would poison our progress by selling short the great character of our people and our enormous capacity to change and grow. But they will not win the day; we will win the day. With your help, with your help, that day will come a lot sooner. I will do my part, but you, my fellow citizens, must do yours.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:34 a.m. at the Frank Erwin Center, as part of the Liz Sutherland Carpenter Distinguished Lectureship in the Humanities and Sciences. In his remarks, he referred to Robert Berdahl, president, William Cunningham, chancellor, Sheldon Ekland-Olson, dean, College of Liberal Arts, and Nikole Bell, student, University of Texas at Austin. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks at a Fundraising Luncheon in Dallas, Texas

October 16, 1995

Thank you very much. Lloyd Bentsen already said this, but I want to reemphasize that in my opinion, when the history of our administration has been written, even those who disagreed with a lot of things I did will say that, unquestionably, Al Gore was the most important and influential Vice President in the history of the United States of America. No other person has been given so

much responsibility and no other person has fulfilled it so well, whether it was in the re-inventing Government movement or in setting environmental and technology policy or dealing with our attempts to work more closely with the Russians across a wide range of issues—and I tell you now there are no Russian missiles pointed at the people of the United States for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age because of the things that we've been doing—or working with Secretary Cisneros on our community empowerment strategy. Right across the board he has made a terrific difference, and besides that, he gives great introductions. [Laughter]

I want to thank Frank and Debbie for doing such a wonderful job, along with all of you on the steering committee. Thank you very, very much.

I thank Secretary Bentsen for being here, for his remarks and for his remarkable service to our country. This country has had very, very few Treasury Secretaries in its long and distinguished history that have had anything like the impact that Lloyd Bentsen had on the economic policy of the United States, as you can see from what others have said about the statistics, to very, very good effect. And a lot of the things we had to do were not easy at the time. I'll say a little more about that in a moment. But I want to say thank you, and I miss you.

I look around this room and I see some people in this room, like my dear friend B. Rapoport who spoke with me at the University of Texas this morning, and Jess Hay, and Audrey and Betty Jo, people I've known more than 20 years and others that I just met since I have been running for or become President. Perhaps there are a few people here I have never met before. I'm going to try to correct that before I leave this office—all over the country. But I want to thank all of you for coming here, and I hope you're coming here in common cause.

This is a remarkable day for our country. In Washington, DC, there may be as many as one million black men actually marching even as we speak here today. And they are doing it, I believe, for the same reasons and based on the same values that the people of Dallas elected Ron Kirk the mayor. They are

saying that we have to do two things in this country: We have to see people who are in difficult circumstances reassert their own discipline and dedicate to personal responsibility for themselves, their families, and their communities; and then we have to bridge this foolish racial divide that continues to plague us, even 30 years after President Johnson saw through the passage of the Voting Rights Act and the Civil Rights Act, because we tend to see the world so differently through our different experiences and lenses. And that's what I went to the University of Texas to talk about today. I don't want to reiterate what I said there, except to say that I think there is fault on both sides and merit on both sides.

I think that the better part of wisdom now is to do two things, first of all, to really have every citizen seek out someone of a different racial or ethnic group and engage in the kind of conversations people think they have but don't really, in which people can be frank and brutally honest about what they honestly feel but in which they have the discipline to listen and open their ears and their minds and their hearts and hear others. I find so often in Washington, DC, perhaps especially in Washington, DC, people say a lot, but they don't listen very well. And I've taken to calling the Speaker of the House once a week and just trying to listen, whether I need to or not—[laughter]—just because I think that it's important for us to listen to one another, for people of different views to actually hear and be able to say what someone on the other side of an issue really believes.

The second thing I think we have to do is to follow people like your mayor or our wonderful Secretary of Housing and Urban Development who actually bring people together to get things done.

I'm deeply indebted to Texas for so many reasons, for Lloyd Bentsen and Henry Cisneros and, of course, for Bill White, who until recently was the Deputy Secretary of Energy. And my lifetime friend Mr. McLarty has a car dealership in Texarkana. I don't know if that counts or not, but I think it does. [Laughter] We're still trying to sell Ross Perot down there. [Laughter]

We've tried to work hard with the people of Texas, and one thing that I've been really

proud of is the support that we've been able to maintain through both Congresses—one in Democratic hands, one in Republican hands—for the space program, something that I strongly support and believe in, and the Vice President does as well. And I thank the Members of the Congress who are here for representing Texas so well and for helping us to move this country forward.

I'd like to—there's hardly anything left for me to say because everybody who's spoken before did so well. And maybe I ought to sit down while I'm ahead. [Laughter] But what I'd like to do today is just to make a few points that I hope you can make to others in the days and weeks and months ahead, because I think the election in 1996 and the budget debate we are having now in 1995 will shape the kind of people we're going to be well into the 21st century.

Let me begin by saying that I am very upbeat about where we are and where we're going, not only because the economic news—although it's good; we do have the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation we've had in 25 years, and I'm proud of the work that everyone did on that. Of course, there's still things to be done. We're going through a period of profound change from an industrial to a technology-based, information-based economy, from the cold war to a global village. And whenever these kinds of big changes happen and the shakeout is occurring, there are a lot of people who kind of fall behind, and we have to catch them up.

We have to not only create jobs, we have to figure out how to raise incomes. That's why we are trying, even in this Congress, to pass the "GI bill for America's workers" that would permit people who lose their jobs to get a voucher from the Federal Government to take to the nearest community college to immediately begin job training. That's why we want the tax cut to emphasize giving families a deduction for the cost of education after high school, so people can continue to strengthen their ability to earn good incomes.

But basically, this economy is going in the right direction. And the most important thing is that we permit those of you in the private sector to succeed by following good, sound policies on the deficit, on trade, on invest-

ment in education, on research and development, on technology, on helping the communities that have been left behind to attract investment and to put people to work.

The Vice President talked about our successes on the social front. There is a real reawakening today. What you see in this march in Washington is really not confined, by any means, to black men, or black men and black women. What is going on today in Washington is a manifestation of a sweeping feeling in the country that the time has come for everyone to assume a higher measure of personal responsibility, to try to come to grips with the incredible dimensions of the social problems that we have allowed to foster and fester in this country over the last generation.

And I believe our policies have played a role. I believe our welfare reform policies, I believe our crime bill, I believe a lot of the things we have done have played a role. But the American people are leading the way to bring the crime rate down. The welfare rolls are down. The food stamp rolls are down. The poverty rate is down. The teen pregnancy rate is down in America.

Now, they're all still too high, every one of them. But the point is that we are at least gaining on it for a change. And what we need to do is to keep gaining on it. There will be problems in this old world as long as people like you and me inhabit the planet because we're not perfect. But the issue is, are we gaining on it, are we getting closer every day to living by the values we believe in, to lifting up the potential of every person, to giving everybody the chance to be the kind of person that they ought to be? The answer is, we are. And what we ought to do is to continue that.

We still have some troubling problems. For example—can you explain this—drug use is down among young adults, but casual drug use is up among juveniles. The crime rate is down among young adults, but random crime is up among juveniles. Why? We're gaining on it, but there's still too many kids out there raising themselves. And we have to keep working on that.

We know now that we can make progress. For years, I heard people talk about social problems in almost hopeless terms. Now we

know we can do something about this. And now there is no excuse for our not doing it. But we can to this.

There is a lot of talk—I don't want to be too political today, but we all know, every time I come to Texas a hundred of my friends say, "You know, if you just spend more time down here, we could carry this State." Then I leave and all the Republicans say, "Oh, you know, he's just another one of those Democratic liberals." And I hate to say it, but every one of them that wants to replace me, except one or two, has spent a whole lot more time in Washington, DC, in the last 20 years than I have. *[Laughter]*

But next time you hear that, ask them, of the last three administrations which one reduced the deficit more, which was the only one to produce a balanced budget, which one reduced the size of the Government, the number of regulations more, which one gave more authority to State and local governments and the private sector and reduced it from the Government, which one passed the toughest crime bill. The answer to all of that, obviously, is our administration.

I say that not to be political myself but to say that the political attacks on this administration may be helpful at election time, but they actually cause a lot of voters to do something that's not in their own interests. And sometimes the conventional wisdom just kind of gets a leg up and people just keep on repeating it. So I want you to go out and help refute the conventional wisdom, not because I think anything I've done in the past justifies reelection—I think people should be re-elected based on what's going to happen in the future—but because I think it is evidence of the values this administration has and the record of performance we will make if we continue into the future.

And you should confront people. You should talk to people. Just in the way I want us to bridge the racial divide, we have to bridge the political divide. The thing I think that surprised me most when I got to Washington was how intensely partisan the place was and how people got away with doing that. Because mostly in a State capital around the country or in a city hall, you'd just collapse; people would just get rid of you if you were

so intensely partisan you never worked with anybody else, you'd never do anything else.

And it's one of the reasons we had to make some tough decisions. I'll just give you one. Lloyd Bentsen will vouch for me on this. When I went to Washington, I knew from talking to Alan Greenspan and a lot of economic experts that if we could get the deficit down at least \$500 billion over 5 years, we'd have a big drop in interest rates and a big boom in the economy—we knew that—and that the \$500 billion, as Secretary Bentsen said to me over and over and over again, was sort of a psychological barrier. If we could just get by it, boy, could we get this economy going again. So we decided that come hell or high water, that's exactly what we were going to do.

And after I'd been in Washington about a week, I was informed by the then minority leaders of the Senate and House, now the Senate majority leader and the Speaker, it didn't matter what I did, I would not get one single, solitary Republican vote for deficit reduction for my budget. And one of them was candid enough to say, "It's great because this is a free thing for us. If it works, we'll deny that it worked and claim it's a tax increase. If it doesn't, we can blame you. You won't get any votes from us, not one." And they were as good as their word. They didn't have a single one for it. *[Laughter]*

Now what did that mean? Since—and you ask your Members of the House here. What it meant was, since we had to pass the budget with only Democrats and we had to reduce the deficit \$500 billion, we had to raise taxes on a lot of you more than we wanted to, and we had to cut spending less. In the end, Lloyd Bentsen said, "We have to do this because all the people that pay more in taxes will make even more in income if we get this economy going again." And so we did it. He didn't want to do it. I didn't want to do it. We wound up with a budget that was not ideal but was still right for America in an intensely partisan atmosphere.

I had never been in anything like that before, and I still think it's not good for America. I think there's enough differences between Republicans and Democrats to run 500 elections, much less this one coming up in 1996. *[Laughter]* So there ought to be

some argument for just getting up tomorrow and trying to work something out so the country's interest will be served and still let people make their decisions. That is what I am committed to doing. But I am not—I am not—going to do anything as President that I believe will make the America of the 21st century, that the children who are here in this luncheon today will grow up and live in, less than it ought to be. That's what this whole budget debate is about.

Don't let anyone tell you this is a debate about balancing the budget. Every outside credible source says both these budget plans are good plans to balance the budget—every one. Every one. Our plan gets a balanced budget in 9 years; theirs does in 7. Our plan has a smaller tax cut more targeted toward education and childrearing. Our plan uses conservative economic forecasts that are consistent with our historic performance, even though we're going to grow more, I think, if we do this right.

But their plan, I believe, violates our most basic values. I believe this is really a contrast between those who really think that winner-take-all is all right, let the market decide everything, and those of us who believe that America is a place where everybody ought to have a chance to win. It's a contrast between a plan that is committed to growing the middle class and shrinking the under class and a plan that would certainly shrink the middle class and grow the under class. That's not the 21st century I want to live in. It's a contrast between a plan that would continue to honor our obligations to our parents and to our children, especially the poorest children among us, and one that would say that's somebody else's problem. That is the difference.

Everybody knows we have to slow the rate of growth in medical care. But their plan would impose great new burdens on some of the poorest elderly people in this country. They would say to all of these people out there living on \$300 or \$400 a month that you have to pay more for your Medicare and Medicaid, even if you can't afford to pay it. They would say to medical centers and urban hospitals that we're going to cut way back on your Medicaid payments, and we hope

you don't have to close, but if you do, it's too bad.

We have to slow the rate of medical inflation, but we have to do it in a disciplined way so that we understand the consequences to the University of Texas Medical Center, to the urban hospitals throughout Texas, to the rural hospitals that provide the only health care people have out in the country, and to elderly people, many of whom barely have enough to live on, not to mention the fact that one in five children today—more than one in five, 22 percent, are eligible for help from the National Government to deal with their health care needs. And they're our children, too, not just the kids that can afford to be at a luncheon like this because their parents have done well. But they're our children, too, and they're our future, too. And we owe them something.

So, yes, I propose to slow the rate of medical inflation, but I don't want us to go plumb off the side of a mountain before we know where we're going. It is not prudent, and it is not consistent with our values.

I don't support one incredible provision of that budget of theirs which would actually raise taxes on families making about \$20,000 a year with two kids by cutting back on the working families tax credit, a credit signed into law under President Ford, a credit expanded under President Bush, a credit President Reagan said was the best antipoverty program ever devised because all it does is to cut taxes and give tax credits to working people who don't have enough money, even though they work full-time, to get above the poverty line because they've got kids at home.

And Lloyd Bentsen and I designed a program that, over a period of years, would enable the United States of America to say, if you will work 40 hours a week and you have children in your house, you will not be taxed into poverty by your Government; your Government will lift you out of poverty. We want people to work, not be on welfare. And we want people to be successful when they're doing their best to work and raise their children. Why in the world we would not do that is beyond me.

I don't think it's smart to cut back on our environmental investments. The Vice Presi-

dent could have told you, but he's too modest to say this. He told me, the first time I ever met him, that all this scientific dispute about whether the globe was warming up was bogus, that it really was, and we were going to be in trouble. Just a couple of weeks ago, we see a whole new raft of scientific evidence and almost unanimity of opinion now that global warming is real, that there is a hole in the ozone layer that is going to affect the whole future of the planet, including the future of the United States. I don't believe eliminating the modest amount of money we invest in studying global warming and what our response ought to be to it is a very good way to balance the budget.

And at a time—we just came to the University of Texas, which every Texan is proud of—I don't think on the edge of the 21st century there's a single business person in this audience who would knowingly cut a corporate budget for education and training, research and development, or technology. The idea that we would consider on the edge of the 20th century cutting back our investment in helping poor kids get off to a good start in school or providing scholarships and loans to people going to college is a mystery to me, since we don't have to do any of that to balance the budget. And you don't have to take my word for it, ask Lloyd Bentsen. We do not have to do any of that to balance the budget.

So don't be fooled. This fight over the balanced budget—when you see your Representatives go back to Washington, it is not about balancing the budget. We can balance, cut taxes, protect Medicare without destroying the social contract and forgetting about our obligations to one another. That is what this is about.

So I ask you to leave here doing two things: One is go out and talk to people who are different from you, just like I asked the people at the University of Texas today, tell them what you heard here and listen to what they think; two, tell the people of Texas we can balance the budget without stepping on our values and trampling on our future and walking away from our obligations to one another.

And that is what we are determined to do. I go back to Washington with that determination because I believe that we're going in the

right direction economically, we're going in the right direction socially, we are better positioned for the next century than any country on the face of the Earth, if we will simply face up to our responsibilities and deal with them with common sense and good values instead of turning them into some sort of ideological fight that will tear the American people apart. I want to bring us together and move us forward.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:20 p.m. in the Plaza Ballroom at Le Meridien Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Debbie and Frank Branson, luncheon cochair; Bernard Rapoport, chairman, board of regents, University of Texas, and his wife, Audrey; and Democratic fundraiser Jess Hay and his wife, Betty Jo. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at the Concert For Hope in Hollywood, California

October 16, 1995

Thank you very much. Thank you, Joe Califano, for your singular determination to keep this issue before the American people. There is not another citizen in the entire United States of America who has done as much as Joe Califano to help us all to come to grips with the implications of substance abuse. And every American is in his debt.

I also want to thank the other honorees for the work they have done, the late Frank Wells and Tony Bennett and our friend Betty Ford. I want to thank the Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia for helping us all to learn more about this, and all the performers tonight for making this a very special evening for the United States.

This mission of ours cuts across politics, geography, income, and race. It must unite all of our people in a common purpose. Tonight in 3,500 cities and towns all across our beloved country, community antidrug coalitions are gathered in auditoriums and town halls to watch this broadcast. These people have played a large role in our antidrug efforts, many of them part of an important campaign led by Lee Brown, our Director of National Drug Control Policy, who accompanied me here tonight. With their help, he

is getting an urgent and very straightforward message to our teenagers: Stay drug-free; you have the power. With marijuana use on the rise among our teens, that's a message every one of us must now help to spread every day.

Tonight the antidrug coalitions all across our country who are sharing this evening with us are honoring some of their own and some of our Nation's finest. I applaud these honorees as well—the parents, the police officers, the prosecutors, the clergy, the social service workers, the doctors, the recovering drug addicts and alcoholics, and all of their families—for they are the true foot soldiers and the real heroes in this, our common national crusade. To them I say, we know your battle is not easy, but you are not alone, and you must keep fighting for all of us and especially for our children.

Like millions of Americans, I know firsthand how a family suffers from both drug and alcohol abuse. The consequences of this kind of abuse are many. But since December 1st is World AIDS Day, we should take special note that 25 percent of AIDS cases are the result of drug abuse. Many other cases can be blamed on the risks our young people take under the influence of drugs or alcohol.

The battle against substance abuse must be waged a person at a time, a family at a time, a school at a time, community by community. But it must be backed by all of our efforts, including the President. We are doing what we can at the national level, with punishment, with working to keep drugs out of the country, with helping our community-based efforts to promote safe and drug-free schools and prevention and treatment programs that are so important. And I will keep fighting to keep these things funded.

But I also hope all of you will help me in this battle against teen smoking. We know that every day 3,000 of our young people begin to smoke, and that 1,000 of them will have their lives end prematurely because of it. Children who reach the age of 20 almost never start smoking if they haven't started by then.

These are our common goals and our common endeavors. We wish for all of our children a drug-free America. It's up to each of us to take the kind of responsibility that your honorees, and the honorees in all those town

halls and auditoriums all across America, have assumed. If we can do our part, we can give this country a drug-free America in the 21st century.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:40 p.m. in the Pantages Theater. In his remarks, he referred to Frank G. Wells, former chief operating officer, Walt Disney Productions; entertainer Tony Bennett; and former First Lady Betty Ford. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks Prior to a Meeting With the Initial Base Adjustment Strategy Committee in San Antonio, Texas

October 17, 1995

Well, I'd like to begin by making an opening statement and to say how very pleased I am to have a chance to come here to San Antonio and to Kelly Air Force Base to follow up on the meeting that I had with the fine committee in Washington 2 months ago.

I know that officials from the Defense Department, John White and Rudy DeLeon, were here in August, and they're back here with me today. And we have done a lot of work with this community. I have been very, very impressed with their Kelly 21 Project, the vision of it, the energy of it. I hope that you have seen the commitment of the administration to try to maintain employment at appropriate levels, to try to have a reasonable period of transition, and to try to make sure that in the end you are as successful as you possibly can be. We believe that if we do this right, we can generate even more employment in this area as we go through this transition period.

I want to say a special word of thanks to your former mayor Secretary Cisneros, who has worked with me very closely on this and advised me. General Viccellio, I want to say I know that this community is very encouraged by the fact that you're going to be overseeing this process. And I want to say a word of appreciation, too, to Congressman Henry B. Gonzalez, who can't be here today—he's in Washington—and of course, to Congressman Frank Tejeda, our prayers

go out to him. I had a quick conversation with him just a few days ago.

The most important thing, I think, to announce today for the San Antonio community is that we have reached an agreement on joint use of the base which will, obviously, permit you to do precisely what you proposed to do. We are committed to implementing that agreement on joint use in good faith. And as I said, my goal is to do this in such a way that the strengths of this community and the strengths of this great resource will generate even more employment and more stability for you at the end of this 5-year process—really an 8-year process—than you had when we began it and than you would have had given the fact that we have to lower our presence all across the country in the aftermath of the cold war.

Mr. Mayor, that's my commitment, and I think we're going to deliver on it. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1 p.m. in the Pilots Lounge in the Base Operations Building. In his remarks, he referred to Deputy Secretary of Defense John White; Under Secretary of the Air Force Rudy F. DeLeon; Gen. Henry Viccellio, Jr., USAF, Commander, Air Force Materiel Command; and Mayor William E. Thornton of San Antonio. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks to the Community at Kelly Air Force Base in San Antonio

October 17, 1995

Thank you. Let's give Frances another hand. Wasn't she great? I thought she did a great job. Mayor Thornton, thank you for your remarks and for your remarkable and energetic leadership during this important time for San Antonio. General Viccellio, thank you for your assumption of this new, important task. General Curtis, thank you for your strong leadership here; to the other dignitaries here present, including the Deputy Secretary of Defense, John White, who has worked so hard on this project at my instruction, but also with his own heart in it; to the members of the Initial Base Adjustment Strategy Committee, or IBASC, as you call it, Jose Villareal, Juan Solis, and Tullos Wells;

to your county judge, Cynthia Taylor Krier; and to the workers here at Team Kelly.

And I'd like to say a special word of acknowledgement to one of the people who came down here with me today, your former mayor and the finest Secretary of Housing and Urban Development this country ever had, Henry Cisneros.

I want to thank the Sky Country and the Band of the West from Lackland for the music they provided before I came here. I want to thank Frances Garza-Alvarado for her introduction and for the example she's set of professionalism and dedication, a model for the people, both men and women, that she helps to train for the jobs of tomorrow. When she talked about how she felt when she came here 30 years ago, I knew that I was right to fight for the families and the people of Kelly and the future of this base and this community, because Frances represents what America is all about.

Before I get into my remarks, I'd also like to acknowledge two friends of Kelly Air Force Base who could not be with us today for different reasons: my friend of many, many years, over 20 years now, Congressman Henry B. Gonzalez, who is working in Washington, and his colleague, Congressman Frank Tejeda.

Frank is in a different sort of fight now, and I want to say a word about him. Many of you know him as more than a Congressman. He's your neighbor; he's your friend. He comes home to his old neighborhood every weekend without fail. He's a decorated Vietnam veteran and a proud son of Texas. He has always been one of *la gente*. If an issue matters to working people, you can bet that Frank Tejeda is there working on it, fighting for them. He's a fighter; he's a winner. I had a wonderful talk with him just a few days ago, and we're all praying that he wins the fight he's involved in now. God bless you, Congressman, and good luck.

San Antonio has made special contributions to the security of this country, not only with Kelly but also with the Randolph Air Training Command, with Brooke Air Force Base, with Lackland Air Force Base, with Fort Sam Houston and the Brooke Army Medical Center.

There are a lot of Presidents who have had special ties to San Antonio because of its commitment to our Nation's military. Most of you probably know that President Roosevelt trained the Rough Riders here. One of the gifts that I was pleased to receive since I became President is an original printing of Teddy Roosevelt's account of how he organized and trained the Rough Riders in San Antonio. President Eisenhower served as a young lieutenant at Fort Sam Houston and met his wife, Mamie, here. President Johnson married Lady Bird in San Antonio, and later was pronounced dead at the Brooke Army Medical Center.

This is an important part of America, and San Antonio's contribution and Kelly's contribution to the security of this country must never be forgotten. Our Nation owes a profound debt of gratitude to all the workers at Kelly for giving our country something that cannot be measured and certainly cannot be purchased, patriotism, service, and heart.

Recently I was so moved, just before I came out here, to hear two things about all of you that I want to repeat for the benefit of all the people of Texas and the people of the United States who will know about this event today. After it was announced that the BRAC commission's decision was to close Kelly and phase out its operations, your Commander told me—General Curtis—that he was walking through the crowd just a few days ago, through the workplace here, and that two of the workers here stopped and said they wanted to ask him something about the new realignment plan we had put in place for Privatization in Place. They didn't ask him about their jobs. They didn't ask him about their retirement. They asked him instead whether he thought that the readiness of the United States of America could be maintained with this new plan. That is the kind of patriotism the United States of America should know about, in this place, among you people. And I am grateful to you.

The other thing I was told about today was that after the announcement was made, when you would normally expect a big decline in morale, that the productivity of operations here went up, not down. If everybody in America had that kind of character, we

wouldn't have half the problems we have in this country. And I thank you for that.

You have been a model of what I believe our country has to do, a model of what I talked about yesterday in my speech on race relations at the University of Texas in Austin, a model of what those people who marched in Washington yesterday were calling on all of us to represent. You have shown personal responsibility and responsibility for your families, your communities, and your country. You have proved that you could work together across racial and ethnic lines. And now we're going to prove that we can harness the changes going on in the world today to make America and San Antonio and the families of Kelly stronger and better.

My mission as your President at this moment in our history is to harness the changes that are going on for the better. As we move from an industrial to an information and technology age, as we move from the cold war, in which you played such a pivotal role, to a global village with different kinds of threats to democracy and freedom, I want to see that we keep the American dream alive for all of our people and that we keep America as the strongest country in the world. Those are our two objectives as we move to the 21st century.

We know that we have to create a modern economy that will grow jobs and enable people to grow good families. We know we have to create a modern Government that is smaller and more flexible. We know we have to maintain America's leadership in the world. And most important of all, we know we have to make all these changes consistent with our basic values as people with responsibility and opportunity, with the idea that people have to be able to succeed at work and in their family lives, with the idea that we are all one community and we have certain obligations to our parents, to our children, to the needy among us so that we can go forward together.

One of the most important things to recognize today in that framework of values is that the people who won the cold war cannot be left out in the cold. We are going through a period of change; everyone knows that. Well, that's fine if you're winning from it, but it's pretty scary if you're not sure what the future holds. By your work, you have

honored your commitment to America. And I came here today to tell you I want you to have hope for the future because we intend to honor our commitment to you.

On July 1st, you were dealt a serious blow when the independent base closing commission said that we ought to shut Kelly down. At my insistence and my refusal to go along with that specific recommendation, the Air Force developed the Privatization in Place plan that will keep thousands of jobs here at this depot. I am here to say that, of course, Kelly will change; that was inevitable because the world has changed. But we are not leaving you out in the cold. We will work with you in partnership to protect jobs, to protect workers, to help the families and communities here, and to make sure you are still contributing to America's mission in the 21st century.

Kelly has been far more than an important military base. It's also been an avenue of opportunity for so many people who could not have found it in other jobs. So many families were lifted into the middle class because of Kelly. And each generation of people in San Antonio and the communities around here have built upon that opportunity.

Henry Cisneros tells me that he grew up on the west side of the city under the flight pattern of Kelly's aircraft. He grew up hearing the prop B-36's, the C-124's, and later the powerful F-16's. He said his entire block worked at Kelly. It's no wonder, from that block of military employed families came the first Cabinet Secretary in the United States Government from San Antonio, and with him came some of the best people in our administration. I want to just name one who is here today, Frank Wing, who after 38 years in the Air Force here at Kelly came to serve under Henry Cisneros in Washington. Thank you, sir, for your lifetime of devoted service.

This base has been a cornerstone for the Hispanic middle class, indeed, for much of middle class San Antonio. The larger area has played a role in our Nation's security for a very long time, as I have already said. I told the Air Force and the Department of Defense when this BRAC decision was announced to take all the time the law allows to reduce the economic impact on the community and to create the strongest possible

economic base at Kelly and to work with the local leaders to plan a future that would give you a chance to have even more prosperity.

That means we're not shutting this base down, we're transforming it. We're maintaining jobs here because it is good for San Antonio, but it's also good for the Air Force. With our plan to move jobs here to the private sector, we'll be helping national security and helping the people of San Antonio.

We call this plan Privatization in Place. It means that for 5 more years, Kelly will keep the jobs that would be here if closure had not been recommended, and even 8 years from now, more than two-thirds of Kelly's jobs will still be here, working for the Department of Defense. But at the same time, we'll create even more jobs. We've seen this work already in other places. For example, at the Sacramento Army Depot in California, private investment there has actually produced thousands of more jobs than the base had at the time it was closed. If you look at this incredible resource here, we can do that and more.

Our plan for Kelly does more than just provide breathing room; it gives you the time we all need for a transition to the future for Kelly and for San Antonio. This base still has an important role in the future of San Antonio, an important role in the security of our Nation. With the 5 extra years we have won for Kelly, the city will have time to diversify its economic base. And we'll have a new opportunity to build another kind of base for jobs, grounded firmly in the private sector and in the strengths of San Antonio, the people, the culture, the ideal location to become a leading center of trade for the 21st century.

More than almost any other place, you are ready for the future. Your workers are among the best trained anywhere. You have the best specialized equipment and the facilities for the future, part of our national investment and part of something private industry really needs. So the incentive for private investment is here, as you found out last weekend when you had hundreds of businesses coming here to look over the potential for the future.

And then of course, there is San Antonio, the ninth-largest city in our Nation, a city that is very large but still is a community,

not a crowd. People like Mayor Thornton and Frank Tejeda and my good friend Jose Villareal and all of the others who have worked on this committee, they have worked hard to prove that you could bring all parts of this community together with a clear-eyed vision for the future. In the name of Kelly and its workers, the people of San Antonio have done something very important. They have given all people here the opportunity to build a better and stronger life.

I know that this plan can work. Deputy Secretary White and Under Secretary of the Air Force Rudy de Leon are working closely with the community here. And because there is no better person to help direct a transition than a former Vice Commander at Kelly, we do have the best in General Butch Viscellio, and I thank him for his dedication to this effort.

At the same time—yes, you could clap for him; I think you ought to. *[Applause]* I know generals don't run for office, but they love to hear the applause. *[Laughter]* They love to hear the applause.

At the same time, your local IBASC commission has been working hard to coordinate the reuse effort here, to develop the strategy and the vision to propel Kelly and San Antonio into the next century. We aren't wasting a second. From day one, we've been pursuing creative initiatives, providing planning funds to help in the effort. We've allocated more than half a billion dollars for construction, personnel, and support help to Kelly and its workers. Just this past weekend, as I said, the open house that was sponsored by the city and the base drew hundreds of contractors and others from the private sector. They saw the potential for success here.

Today I am proud to announce that we have reached an agreement between the community and the Air Force and the Federal Aviation Administration to allow the joint use of the Kelly runway between the Air Force and private sector.

That puts San Antonio in a prime position to handle the growth of trade from all over our hemisphere, all the way down to the tip of Tierra del Fuego. If diversity is America's strength, and it is, San Antonio will have the muscle when it comes to trade with Latin America.

More action is on the way. Let me say that this is a time of hope for San Antonio. You're one of the youngest cities in the country. You have the position, the resources, the proven character and ability to take advantage of the future. You are organized, skilled, and now sitting on some of the best real estate and biggest opportunities in the entire United States.

I know the BRAC decision last summer was a disappointment. And if you saw me in my rare, unguarded moments, you knew that I was disappointed, too. But I believe that San Antonio will come out a winner with a healthier, more diversified economic base and better jobs, a community moving confidently into the next century as a center of trade and a vital player in our national security. And let me emphasize again, for the benefit of the two workers who asked the general that the other day, this plan is designed to strengthen our national security, not to weaken it.

No American should forget that. If our mission as a people is to go into the 21st century with the American dream alive for all people and to keep America the strongest country in the world, then we have to have a good economic plan, a modern Government, mainstream values driving everything we do. And that means we have to maintain America's leadership in the world. It is not an option for us to walk away from our role and our responsibilities. And you will be helping us do that well into the next century.

Let me close by saying something that you must already know. Your local leaders here have a vision and a plan. I believed all along that we could not walk away from San Antonio or from Kelly or from the people here. And we have a national plan that will permit you the time you need to take advantage of the changes going on in the world and to maintain an important role in our national security. But the real strength of these plans will come from you, from your character, your work, and your own vision, and your willingness to believe in yourselves and the future.

If you look at how we in the United States are positioned now and imagine what the world will look like 10 or 20 or 30 years from now when all the children in this audience

have their children at meetings like this, I tell you, there is no nation in the world in a better position to do well in the global village of the 21st century, if we will seize our opportunities. And to do that, we have to believe in ourselves, stay true to our mainstream values, and make the changes we know that will harness the future for a better America.

That's what you can do. I will be there with you. I know that you can do it. If you believe you can do it, there is no stopping you.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:06 p.m. In his remarks, he referred to Maj. Gen. Lewis E. Curtis III, USAF, Commander, San Antonio Air Logistics Center.

Remarks at a Fundraising Dinner in Houston, Texas

October 17, 1995

Well, Secretary Bentsen, that was such a wonderful introduction, I almost forgive you for leaving. *[Laughter]* The operative word is "almost." I thank Lloyd and B.A. for their friendship and the gifts they've given our country. And I tell you that when the history of the last 50 years of the 20th century is written in the United States, the work that Lloyd Bentsen did to not only help to get hold of this terrible out-of-control deficit but to do it in a way that would permit us to invest in our people and our future and to connect the United States to the rest of the world through NAFTA, through the GATT world trade agreement, and in so many other ways will mark him as one of the greatest Secretaries of the Treasury in the history of the United States of America.

I want to thank two other Texans who are here who made immeasurable contributions to our administration: the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Henry Cisneros. If you ask anybody who has followed the work of that Department in the few decades that it has existed, they will tell you that without question he is the best Secretary of Housing and Urban Development ever to serve in that position. And we're very proud of him. And my good friend Bill

White, who just came home to Houston after being Deputy Secretary of Energy, thank you, sir. I will say again that between Bill White and Hazel O'Leary and Ron Brown, the Secretary of Commerce, they did more to further the energy interest of the United States and to create jobs in the United States by getting investment abroad than any previous administration has ever done. Thank you, sir, for what you did in that, and I appreciate that very much.

My heart is full of gratitude tonight and so many wonderful things have been said that if I had any sense I'd just sit down. *[Laughter]* I'm afraid if I talk on now I'll disqualify myself for reelection. But I'm going to talk anyway. *[Laughter]*

I want to thank the statewide chairs of these galas we've had. I have had two wonderful days in Texas. I thank Arthur Schecter, who made a wonderful statement earlier, and Joyce; Lee and Sandra Godfrey and Stan McClellan; Lou Congillan; Sheldon and Sunny Smith; and George Bristol and Frank and Debbie Branson, who did such a wonderful job for us in Dallas yesterday. Thank you very much. Thank you, all of you.

My good friend of nearly 25 years who is only a year younger than me and looks 15 years younger than me—I resent it bitterly, but I still love Garry Mauro. Thank you, my friend, and Judith, his wife.

I'm really glad to see Ann Richards and Mark White here. I used to be a Governor, you know, back when I had a real life. And we served together, and we enjoyed it immensely.

I appreciate Attorney General Morales and former Attorney General Mattox being here. I told somebody the other day—he said, "What's the best job you ever had?" And I said, "I was attorney general; that was the best job I ever had." And they said, "Why?" And I said, "Well, I didn't have to hire or fire or appoint or disappoint, raise taxes or cut spending. And every time I did something unpopular, I blamed it on the Constitution." *[Laughter]* So, remember that.

I want to say a special word of thanks to Congresswoman Sheila Jackson Lee and Congressman Jim Chapman for their work for our country and for your State in the Con-

gress. And let me say a great word of thanks, too, to Bob Bullock for what he said and for the private things that he has said to me in the last 2 days. It's been a great inspiration to me. And I was sitting there thinking that I could play that talk he was giving in several States, and it would help us. I wish I could patent it and send it around like that Ozark water you talked about. *[Laughter]*

And finally, let me say a special word of thanks, too, to Mayor Bob Lanier and his wife, Elise. We came in and we got out of the car—I spend a lot of time with a lot of mayors and I have many, many very close friends who are mayors, but I'm not sure there is any mayor in America who has the particular combination of compassion and intellect and old-fashioned practical insight. It's really quite a genius, you know, to not just talk about problems but to actually do something about them. And in so many ways, Bob Lanier has done that. And I guess that's why he got 91 percent last time. He has promised that if you beat it this time, that he will give me a few that he has to spare in '96. *[Laughter]* So I hope that you will do that.

I want to thank Reverend Caldwell for praying over us tonight and for his mission and his ministry and for bringing his wonderful wife, who is a native of my State. His mother-in-law was a supporter and a woman I got to know, a remarkable woman. I'm delighted to see you here, sir. Thank you both for coming.

I'd like to thank Terry McAuliffe and Laura Hartigan and Meredith Jones, our Texas finance director, for the work they did and all those who helped them for this fine night. I thank you.

I also want to say a word on behalf of two people who are not here tonight. The Vice President had meant to come with me when we were going to do this last night, but I—thanks to the sponsors here in Houston, we were able to defer this until this evening so that I could go out to California last night and participate in a national benefit for the Center on Alcohol and Substance Abuse Prevention, something that is very important to me because I've dealt with both those issues in my family and because our administration is committed to making progress on that. And

I thank you for your indulgence, but that kept the Vice President from coming.

I just want to say that even my severest detractors, when our administration's history is written, will say that Al Gore was the most influential Vice President in 219 years of the American Republic. And I thank him for his work on the environment, on reinventing Government, on technology, on helping us with Russia. But most of all, I thank him just for being there.

When we work together, I wonder what all of those other Presidents did and why they didn't do more with this incredibly flexible office. The only thing the Vice President really has to do is to sort of show up in the Senate when there is a tie vote, and hang around waiting for something to happen to me. *[Laughter]* Every day I think about that, I do a few more sit-ups and—*[laughter]*—you know, do what I can to avoid that. So, you know, you've got a fellow with a high IQ and a reasonable amount of energy, it seems like a shame just to let him hang around. *[Laughter]* And I really think he's done a magnificent job. I'm so proud of him, and we have a genuine partnership.

I'd also like to say that I know that the First Lady would like to be here with us tonight, but as some of you doubtless know, she has been on a very, very successful trip to Latin America. She went to Nicaragua, to Chile, to Brazil, and to Paraguay. And since the people of Texas understand better than any other people in the United States how important our partnership with Latin America is, I hope you will excuse her absence.

I've been trying to think of what I ought to talk about tonight. You saw a movie about the accomplishments of the administration, and then Secretary Bentsen was kind enough to get up and talk about it, and others did. What I'd like to do is to give you some arguments for the next year. I've heard all this talk about how the Democratic Party is dead because we don't have any new ideas or we're too liberal or we're slaves to Government. And I have concluded that since they keep winning elections with those arguments, we're better at doing and they're better at talking. So I want to give you some talking tonight, if I could.

I have learned a few things about the limits of liberalism. I heard a story the other day—my senior Senator, Dale Bumpers, called me and told me a story I want to share with you about the limits of liberalism, involving Huey Long, the famous populist Governor and Senator of Kentucky. One day, you know, when we were in the middle of the Depression and we had—I mean, Louisiana. [Laughter] I've got a Kentucky story I wanted to tell, but I decided, upon reflection, I shouldn't tell it. So my conscience is clicking in on me.

Anyway, when—do you remember, Huey Long—those of you who are old enough to remember when he was Governor and then later Senator, he campaigned around the State and then around the country on this “share the wealth” platform. He came up north to Arkansas, actually, and helped a woman named Hattie Caraway get elected to the Senate. The first woman in American history ever elected to the Senate in her own right was Hattie Caraway from Arkansas. And the only time anybody ever came into our State as an outsider and helped anybody win an election was Huey Long. He was a great politician. And unemployment was 25 percent in America, and the per capita income of Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi was only about half the national average. So you could say whatever you want to about sharing the wealth, and you had a pretty willing audience.

And he was out on a country crossroads one day, talking about how we ought to share the wealth. And there were all these farmers standing around. He saw this old boy in overalls, and he said, “Farmer Jones,” he said, “let me ask you something.” He said, “Now, if you had three Cadillacs, wouldn't you give us one so we could go around here on these country roads and pick up these kids and take them to school during the week and take them to church on Sunday?” He said, “Of course, I would.” He said, “If you had \$3 million, wouldn't you give us a million dollars so we could put a roof over every family's head and give them a good meal at night and breakfast in the morning?” He said, “You bet I would.” He said, “If you had three hogs—” and he said, “Now, wait a minute, Governor, I've got three hogs.” [Laughter]

So the Democrats, to be fair, have learned a few things about the limits of liberalism. [Laughter]

Here's what I think is going on. This is a time of extraordinary change but very great promise for this country. We're moving from an industrial age to an information and a technology age. We're moving out of the cold-war era into a global village, where we're all closer together than ever before and where there are vast new opportunities for cooperation existing alongside the new security threats of terrorism, biological and chemical warfare, organized crime, and global drug trafficking. What we have to do is to harness all this change to make America a better place.

I ran for President with a clear mission in my own mind to try to take good care of this country to achieve two objectives in the 21st century: One was to make sure that the American dream was alive and well for all people without regard to their race, their income, or their region. And the second was to make sure that America continued to be the strongest country in the world, so that someone could lead the world after the cold war toward greater freedom and greater democracy and greater security and greater prosperity. That's what I wanted to do.

I said at the time that I thought we would have to move beyond the old political debate that parties had been having for many years toward what I called a new democratic philosophy. And I'd just like to go over what those elements were that I told you I would try to bring to the Presidency.

I said I thought our economic policy ought to be based on growth, not dividing the pie but growing the economy more; that we ought to do whatever it took to maintain our world leadership but that we couldn't be involved in everybody's problem everywhere; that we needed a new form of Government that would be smaller and less bureaucratic, would be more entrepreneurial, would give more responsibility to State and local governments and to the private sector, would embrace all kinds of new ideas, but would still fulfill our fundamental obligations that can only be done by the National Government; and that all of this ought to be done based on a reassertion of old-fashioned mainstream

values that I think got lost over the last 10 or 20 years: that we needed both responsibility and opportunity in our country, that people had to be able to succeed both at work and in their family lives, that we had to have both growth and fairness in our country, and that in the end we had to decide, as Mayor Lanier said, to be a community. We had to decide that we had certain obligations to one another. That's what people in a community feel.

If we have no obligations to one another, then we're not a community, we're just a crowd. We occupy the same piece of land, but we're just going to elbow each other until whoever is strongest winds up at the front of the line. And we never will turn over our shoulder to see what happened to the others. Being a community means you have obligations to our parents, to our children, to those who need help through no fault of their own. It also means that we revel in and cherish and build up our diversity, we don't use it as a cheap political trick to divide the American people. That's what it means.

Now, what I want to say to you tonight is that I believe I've been faithful to that and I believe this country is moving in the right direction, thanks mostly to the American people. But I believe that our administration has made its contributions.

You heard what was said about the economy, about the growth of the economy. The misery index that the other party used to talk about so much, the combined rates of unemployment and inflation, you never hear them mention it anymore because it's at the lowest level it's been in 25 years.

And beyond the new jobs, I'm really proud of the fact that we've had the largest number of new small businesses incorporated in the last 2½ years of any comparable period in American history; that we've got, thanks in no small measure to the remarkable partnership Henry Cisneros has established with the housing industry in America, we have 2½ million new homeowners, a record number for such a short time. And if he keeps going, we're going to have two-thirds of the American people in their own homes by the end of the decade, something that has never been done before.

Most of the credit goes to the American people, but the fact that we drove down the deficit while increasing our investment in technology, in research, in the education of our people, and that we expanded trade dramatically—up 4 percent in '93, 10 percent in '94, 16 percent in '95—those things have made a contribution to that economic picture because we broke the mold.

We brought down the deficit and invested in our people. We went for free trade with NAFTA and GATT in 80 agreements with other countries, including 15 with Japan. But we also went for fair trade that looked after labor standards and the environment and that finally, finally got an agreement with Japan that we can enforce on automobile related issues. These are important things that will make a difference over the long run. And I think they're worthy of support.

You heard what Mr. Schecter said about the role the United States has played in world peace; I won't belabor that. I will tell you that this is also a safer country than it was 2½ years ago. There are no Russian missiles pointed at anyone in America for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age. We are moving toward a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty next year. We have extended indefinitely the agreement of over 170 nations not to be proliferators of nuclear weapons. We are making progress in working with other countries in fighting terrorism, in fighting the spread of biological and chemical weapons, in trying to make the American people safer. I am proud of that. And we have to continue to do it.

This Bosnia issue has been difficult, but we must lead here. And if we can get a peace agreement, as the leader of NATO, we have to help implement it. Otherwise, we will have a terrible problem in the middle of Europe that can engulf us in the future.

Do we have problems? Yes, of course, we do. We still have too much income inequality. You always have that when you change from one economic arrangement to another and everything gets shaken up. The people that are best positioned to do well, do very well. Those that aren't positioned to do well get hurt worse. And we have to do something about that. And I've put forward a program to do that, to offer more educational opportu-

nities, to raise the minimum wage, to give middle income families a tax deduction for the cost of a college education so that more people can get that education.

We have to deal with that, but let's see it in the context of what's happening. This country is generating jobs and growth and opportunity. There will always be problems as long as the world exists. We need to focus on the problems but keep doing what is working in America.

If you look at the issue of Government—Lloyd Bentsen said the Government's 165,000 smaller than it was when I took office; let me tell you what that means. Next year, the Federal Government will be the smallest it's been since Kennedy was President. But more importantly, as a percentage of the work force, the Federal Government today is the smallest it's been since 1933. I hardly think that qualifies us to be the party of big Government.

We've done more to give authority to States to get out from under Federal rules on welfare and health care experiments than the last two administrations combined did in 12 years. We have done more to get rid of thousands and thousands of pages of regulations. We are trying to make this Government work. Does it still do dumb things? Of course. Do we make mistakes? You bet we do. Is the answer to abolish the Federal Government? No. No. The answer is to have it be smaller but make it so it can still protect people.

This is a fundamental decision that's at issue in this election season, that's at issue in this budget fight. Do you really believe that the market will solve all problems and we'd be better off without any Government? Are you willing to tolerate the occasional mistake of a Government that is transforming itself radically in order to know that somebody is there looking out for the public interest and our obligations to one another as a community.

Do we need to do more? Of course, we do. I still want the line-item veto, lobby reform, campaign finance reform. There's lots of things we can do. But the point is, we're going in the right direction. The answer is to reform the National Government, not to dismantle it. That is the answer. That's what

will work for America. That is the right approach.

If you look at whether we've furthered our values or not, let me tell you that I want to give you some statistics that will support what you saw yesterday in that march. Forget about all the speeches and all the politics about it and everything; just remember the faces of the people that were at that march yesterday. Listen to what they said. That march was about them and their desire to reassert responsibility for themselves, their families, their communities. Their understanding that until everybody in America is willing to do their part, then the Government can't fix the problems, no one else can—that is a beautiful and awesome thing, and no one should denigrate it and no one should underestimate it.

What I tried to do at the University of Texas yesterday was to give a clear voice to what I believe was in the hearts and minds of most of the people who showed up there yesterday. But I believe it's in the hearts and minds of most Americans. And I think it is a great tragedy that people who basically share the same values and, frankly, have a lot of the same problems often cannot reach across the divide at one another.

But what I want to tell you is, this country, even more than what you saw at the march yesterday, across racial and gender and age and regional lines, there is a reawakening in this country, a sort of a coming back to common sense and shared values and a determination to go into the future with greater strength and character and devotion to the things that make life worth living.

And I'll just give you a few examples of that. In the last 2½ years, the crime rate is down, the murder rate is down, the welfare rolls are down, the food stamp rolls are down, the poverty rate is down, the teen pregnancy rate is down. A lot of people don't know that. Now, no Government program did that. That's the folks that live in this country getting themselves together and sort of—you know, we're a great big, complicated country, and we change slowly, but that's an awesome thing when you think about that.

Now, I think our policies helped. I think we helped when we cut taxes on 15 million working families who were making modest

incomes, so that we'd be able to say, if you work 40 hours a week and you've got kids in your house, you won't be in poverty anymore. I think that was a good thing to do. I think that was an honorable thing to do.

I think the family and medical leave law helped. I don't think people ought to lose their jobs if their parents get sick or their baby's born and they need to be there.

I think the 35 States who we gave permission to experiment with welfare reform—I think that helped. I'll give you an example. One thing that they're doing in Texas that I agree with is they have asked for permission to get out from under Federal rules so that they can say if you want a welfare check and you've got a child, you have to prove your child has been immunized against serious diseases. We have one of the lowest immunization rates in the country. I think it's a great idea. It's a great idea.

And I hope—I think the crime bill helped. I appreciate what Mayor Lanier said. I was very moved by what I saw that he was trying to do in Houston when I ran for President. And that crime bill, by putting 100,000 police on the street and community policing is helping America to lower the crime rate, but also by emphasizing the prevention and giving these kids something to say yes to, that's also helping to lower the crime rate. And I want to say more about that in a minute.

I just want you to remember this little moment from yesterday's speech in Texas—at the University of Texas, I mean. I tried to say that a lot of what has to be done to bridge the racial divide requires first the assumption of personal responsibility by all Americans without regard to race. Second, the ability to talk honestly and listen carefully to one another—we don't do enough of that. We still haven't even scratched the surface of that. But thirdly, there are responsibilities of things we have to do. One of the big fights I'm in now with Congress is whether we ought to just get rid of all this money for prevention. Now, they say they like this, giving the States and localities the right to spend the money; that's what we did. We said, here's the prevention money. I don't know what works in Houston and whether it would work in Hartford, Connecticut. I know one thing, you get enough kids in these programs

playing soccer after school or learning to play golf or doing whatever else these kids are doing, you get all of them in there, and your crime rate is going to go down. You're going to save a lot of kids' lives. You won't have to spend all that money building jails and putting them in prison. You can spend less money and educate them and have them do well. I believe that.

I have always believed we should be very tough on crime. I have always believed that in some crimes you just have to give up and be unforgiving. But I am often reminded of one of my favorite lines of poetry that was written in the context of the turmoil in Ireland but applies to the children growing up alone on these mean streets today. William Butler Yeats once said, "Too long a sacrifice can make a stone of the heart." And we shouldn't forget that.

Our biggest problem today is, in spite of all those good numbers I told you, in spite of the fact—one thing I didn't say is that drug usage among young adults is down—in spite of all that, the violent crime rate among juveniles in most cities is up. Casual drug use, especially marijuana, among young teenagers—not young adults, among teenagers—is up. Why? Because there's too many of those kids out there raising themselves. And nobody's looking after them and making sure they have something to do, something to say yes to. The mayor told me that the juvenile crime rate is not going up in Houston because those kids are being engaged.

So I say to you, we're moving in the right direction. The answer is to do more of this, to do more things consistent with our basic values, not to do less, not to do less.

This is a great country. We are getting our act together culturally and socially. And our economy is going great. What we have to do is to figure out how to spread the benefits of the economy to people who don't have it and how to deal with the social and cultural problems that need some help from the outside, that can't be totally solved by individuals and families on their own. This is what I want you to think about: That means that a great deal of the rhetoric in Washington today is irrelevant to what we have to do, to the future, and that's what bothers me about it.

Now, you want to deal with yesterday's rhetoric—and the Republicans say, "Well, Clinton's liberal; the Democrats are liberal; they love big Government"—you got a few questions you can ask them. You say, "Well, if that's true, of the last three Presidents, who cut the deficit more? Who was the only one to present a balanced budget? Who reduced regulation more? Who gave more authority to State and local governments to get out from under the Federal Government more of the last three Presidents? Who cut the size of Government more? Who cut taxes more for small businesses?" Believe it or not, we did in 1993, thanks to Lloyd Bentsen. Those are all facts. Who had the most pro-family welfare and child support and tax policies? We did.

But that is not the argument we need to make. I want you to say that; maybe that will open some people's ears and eyes. But that's not what this is about. This is not about politics. This is about the people of the United States, about our future, about how we're going to get into the 21st century, remember, with the American dream alive for everybody, with America the strongest country in the world. That is the mission. The mission is what happens to the people—not what happens to the politicians, not what happens to the political parties—what happens to the people of the United States of America.

And I ask you to consider just two things as I move out of this and leave you here and go back to work. First is, in a time of change the President has to do what is right for the long run, which means inevitably he will do things that will be unpopular in the short run. Now, that is absolutely true. I'd bet everything I've got in the bank, which isn't all that much—[laughter]—that I've done four or five things that made everybody in this room mad in the last 2½ years. And sometimes I've been wrong. But I show up every day. [Laughter] But the point I want to make here, what I want to say is, you have to understand that when things are changing so quickly and the moment is there, you cannot even imagine what will be popular in a month or a year in a time of change like this. You have to think about what it would look like in 10 or 20 years.

When Lloyd Bentsen and I—he didn't tell you the whole story—I'll tell you the whole story about that budget—probably people in this room still mad at me at that budget because you think I raised your taxes too much. It might surprise you to know that I think I raised them too much, too. But you know why we did it? Because we had been in Washington—you ask—we had been in Washington one week when the then-minority leaders of the House and Senate, now the Senate majority leader and the Speaker of the House, informed us that we would not get not one single, solitary vote from the other party for our budget, no matter what we did, and were very candid. They said, "We want to be in a position to blame you if the economy continues to go down. And if it goes up, we want to be in a position to attack you for raising taxes, whether you raise taxes on people or not. You're going to raise taxes on some, and that's the attack we want, so we're not going to vote for it, not a one of us."

Well, needless to say, we had information, as you heard Secretary Bentsen say, that if we could get the deficit down \$500 billion in 5 years, we could lower interest rates and boom the economy. And so we decided, even with only Democrats voting for it, we would have to make whatever decisions would be necessary to do that, even though it meant a little more tax and a little less spending cut than we wanted. And we reasoned—and I remember him telling me this, he said, "I'm going to pay more, but most people will make a whole lot more money if we get this economy going than they'll pay in extra taxes." And that's exactly what happened. It was the right thing for America for the long run, even though it was difficult politics in the short run. It was the right thing to do.

You know and I know they cut us a new one in Texas over the assault weapons ban and the Brady bill. [Laughter] But let me tell you something. Since we adopted the Brady bill, last year, 1994, there were 40,000 felons who did not get handguns and didn't have a chance to shoot innocent Americans because of it.

I know when we had to decide whether we should move the administration through the FDA to try to crack down on teenage

smoking and restrain advertising directed at teenagers, all the political advice was, "Don't do that. Don't do that, because if you do that, everybody that's against you will vote against you, and everybody that's for you can find some other reason to vote against you."

That's why things often don't get done, by the way, in national politics. [Laughter] Because organized, intense, minority interests will all vote against you and will terrify whoever they can terrify if you do such and such a thing, and then everybody that agrees with you will find some other reason to be against you. So it paralyzes the political system.

But we studied this problem for 14 months. Three thousand kids a day start smoking; 1,000 of them are going to die earlier because of it. How much political hit is 1,000 lives a day worth? I think it's worth a whole lot. It's the right thing to do. Twenty years from now, there will be a lot more kids alive because of the initiatives of the administration. It is the right thing to do.

Most of you liked it when I helped Mexico, but the day I did it, there's a poll in—the Washington Post came out, the poll was 81–15 against what I did. I thought it just another day at the office. [Laughter]

But the American people could not possibly see ahead 10, 20 years to what would happen to the United States if the economy of Mexico failed and the financial markets in Argentina and Brazil collapsed. And our whole strategy for growing the American economy in the 21st century in a world economy, but starting in our backyard with Mexico and the rest of Latin America and then moving to Asia, Europe, and other places would be wrecked. And our ability to cooperate in fighting drugs and in dealing with illegal immigration and all these things would have been undermined.

So I said to myself, "Yes, it's unpopular, but this is a good country. People are fair-minded. Maybe it will work out in the next year or two. But whether it does or not, 20 years from now, it will look like a very good decision." That is the way we all have to begin to think. And when we do, then we can begin to dismiss out of hand these trivial wedge issues that are designed to divide us and drive a stake in our hearts.

I applaud the mayor for not abandoning affirmative action. It's not time yet. It's not time yet. It's not time yet. We had so many different programs in Washington, there were things wrong with them. We're trying to fix them. And any time you do anything, if you do it long enough, somebody will make a mistake, and then someone else can go find it, and they can blow it up in a 30-second ad and make it look like, you know, you can't find your way home at night. [Laughter] But it is not time yet.

If we haven't learned anything from the last few weeks, we should have learned that. We have still got work to do to make sure everybody has a chance to participate on fair and equal terms in the bounty of America.

So these are the things we have to do, and that's what I want you to see. Now, having said that, I want you to see this fight over the budget in these terms.

Let me tell you as you leave here, this is not about balancing the budget. For the first time since Lyndon Johnson was President, the President and the leaders of Congress are committed to balancing the budget. That is a very good thing. I applaud the Republican leadership for that. This is not about slowing the rate of medical inflation and securing the Medicare Trust Fund for the first time in a good while. We're both committed to that. The issue is, how are we going to do it, and are we going to do it in a way that is consistent with our values and with common sense and bringing us together?

Now, my budget is a good, credible, conservative budget. It gets rid of hundreds of programs. But it does not—it does not, in this age, gut education or research or technology. I want everybody to get on that information superhighway and ride straight into the 21st century, and it is nuts for us to cut education if we're going to do that. It is wrong. And it doesn't hurt families. I can't imagine my getting a deduction for Chelsea's college costs, which is what would happen under their bill, and turn around and raising taxes on families making \$20,000 a year trying to support three children. But that's exactly what they do. That's wrong. That is wrong. It doesn't make sense, and it's wrong.

And on the health care issue, you may think there's a lot of demagoguery in it, but

let me tell you—we have got to slow the rate of medical inflation, but that is happening. Health insurance premiums went up less than inflation this year for the first time in 10 years. We can fix this. But we do not want to cut Medicare so much.

Listen to this. This is their proposal: Cut Medicare so much that we stop paying the copay requirements for really poor elderly people. You've got a lot—a bunch of old folks out there living on \$300 a month. And the way this budget, their budget, is written now, they get hit the hardest. We stopped—because right now, we pay their copays and their deductibles because they don't have enough money to live on. And it's estimated a million elderly people could drop out of the Medicare system if the budget passed. We don't have to do that. We don't have to do that.

And we don't have to go back to the time where we say to an elderly couple, if they're lucky enough to both live and be happy, and they're way up in their seventies or eighties, and they're still together, but they don't have much money, and one of them needs to go into a nursing home, we don't have to go back to the time when you could tell the person that's not going into the nursing home, "You've got to sell your house. You've got to sell your car. You've got to clean out your bank account, or your spouse can't get any help." Do you really want to give those people that choice? I don't. We don't have to. It's in their budget, but we don't need it to balance the budget. And I'm going to fight it. It's not right. It's not right.

Do you really want to take thousands of kids out of the chance to be in the Head Start program or cut the number of college scholarships for poor kids at the time when we need more children going to college? What do you think it's going to do to the racial dialog in this country when you need more and more and more education? Look around here. If we'd had this dinner 20 years ago and charged us to get in, would there have been any black people here? Would there have been any Hispanic people here? No. How do you think they got here? They have good educations. What are we going to do—does that make any sense? No.

I could go on and on and on. This is—they want to get rid of the Commerce Department. Who do you think is opening all these doors for all these Texas energy companies in these countries that many people just learned existed a couple of years ago? [Laughter] The Commerce Department, the Energy Department, the United States of America, working in partnership with our business interests to create jobs here in America by building bridges of commerce around the world. Why should we do that? We don't have to, and it doesn't make any sense.

Let me tell you something about the Medicaid program. This is the last one I'll mention. This is big for Houston. The Medicaid program: Most people think that that's that program for health care for poor people on welfare. Well, that's sort of true. About 30 percent of the Medicaid program goes to pay for health care mostly for children of welfare families; 70 percent of it goes to help older people who don't have a lot of money in their nursing homes or home health care, or to help the disabled population in America.

And when that happens, it means that their middle class children, if you're talking about nursing homes, or their middle class brothers and sisters and parents, if you're talking about the disabled, are therefore able to save the money they have and educate their children and maintain a middle class lifestyle. And it holds us together. I don't know a single, solitary health care provider in the United States of America who believes we can maintain the quality of health care we've got now for all those people if we put these Medicaid cuts in.

Not only that, the Medicaid program helps cities like Houston big time. Why? Because the Medicaid program gives extra money to university teaching hospitals, gives extra money to children's hospitals, gives extra money to inner-city hospitals, gives extra money to rural hospitals in all those little towns in Texas that are 90 miles from nowhere and wouldn't be able to give health care if they didn't have country hospitals out there. What's going to happen to that? Is that what you want? I'm not for that. We don't have to do that.

And then there are all those little curlicues in the budget. You know how they're giving everything to the States, right? The States are the source of all wisdom now—[laughter]—all wisdom. They're never going to make a mistake. We're giving everything to the States except a few things. For example, they've decided that Texas, even though Texas just passed a tort reform law, you don't have enough sense to do your own laws. So they want to take away your right to decide what your malpractice laws are and what all your other laws are. They want to just take that away. All of a sudden, you can do everything but decide what your legal system is.

And last week—you know what they did last week? This is an amazing thing. One of their committees, last week they said, "We're going to give the Medicaid program back to the States in a block grant. Now, we're going to cut their money by 30 percent, but we're sure they'll do fine because they're so much more efficient than we are, they can get lower costs." And the next vote—I mean within the same hour they voted to stop States from being able to bargain with drug companies to get cheaper prescription drugs. [Laughter]

This is not about balancing the budget. This is about whether you believe America should be a winner-take-all society or a society where everybody has a chance to win. That's what this is about. It's about whether you believe that the market can solve every problem in the world, or that all human systems are imperfect and democracies are instituted to find fair ways to treat people fairly so we can go forward together.

I'm telling you, folks, this country is in better shape than it was 2 years ago. Part of it is because we have had a good economic policy. We've had good social policies. We've done the right things by the Government. We stood up for America around the world. But a big part of it is, the American people are changing the way they live and think, and they are moving into the future. And you deserve better than what is in that budget. And I'm going to do my best to see that you get it. It is the right thing for America. And I want you to help me. And I want you to fight for it because it's right for you.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:15 p.m. in the Westin Galleria Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to former Secretary of the Treasury Lloyd Bentsen and his wife, B.A.; former Texas Governors Ann Richards and Mark White; Texas Attorney General Dan Morales and former Texas Attorney General Jim Mattox; Lt. Gov. Bob Bullock; Texas Land Commissioner Garry Mauro; and Terence McAuliffe, national finance chair, and Laura Hartigan, national finance director, Clinton-Gore '96.

Remarks on Presenting the National Medals of Science and Technology

October 18, 1995

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President, Senator Glenn, Senator DeWine, distinguished members of our administration involved in science and technology and research and development, to our honorees, their friends, and other distinguished visitors to the White House today: I was looking at the Vice President, listening to him eloquently lay the case out and thinking to myself how fortunate we are to have a Vice President who knows so much and cares so much about these issues and wishing that you could all do something for him, those of you who are being honored today. You see, since Sunday, he has been in Haiti, Texas, and Tennessee, and I have been in Connecticut, Texas, California, Texas, and back here. And what we need is some nonbiologically damaging way to stay awake and on the job today. If any of you could come up with an idea before you leave today with your medals, we would be immensely grateful to you. [Laughter]

Today it is a great honor for both the Vice President and me to honor outstanding Americans whose contributions to science and technology have enriched not only the United States but the entire world. Through persistence and focused intellectual energy, they have stretched our horizons, expanded the frontiers of knowledge, peeled away the secrets of nature, cured disease, created new industries such as that of optical storage. Through technologies like virtual reality, they will let doctors treat soldiers on the battlefield and let children on our prairies learn from teachers in our cities.

They have even affected the lives of people of this country in more direct ways. They have invented the adhesive used for Post-Its. All of them have performed research that will pay off richly for the United States in the 21st century. In whatever their field or specialty, their spark of genius has lighted the landscape of human knowledge and pushed back the shrouds of ignorance.

We are proud of all of you and what you have done. Your achievements give us confidence that the United States will continue to lead in science and technology for many years to come.

In a year when seven of nine Nobel laureates for science and mathematics were Americans, we can feel assured that our scientific leadership is unchallenged. We can also feel proud that every one of these Nobel Prize winners has been supported in their research efforts by the United States Government.

In honoring these pioneers, we must ask and answer a fundamental question: At the edge of the 21st century, how will we ensure that America remains the strongest nation in the world? How can we pass on to every child the American dream of opportunity?

The world is changing rapidly from the industrial to the information technology age, from the cold war to the global village. We live at a time of remarkable promise, when dazzling new technologies are poised to transform how we work, how we learn, how we get information, indeed, how we organize our patterns of living. Consider that at the turn of the century, nearly half of American people were living on farms. At the midpoint of the century, 4 of 10 of us worked in industries. At the end of this century, most of us will be knowledge workers. That remaking of the economic landscape will only accelerate in the years to come, as we morph from the machine age to the information age.

Al told me to say that. Did I do okay? *[Laughter]* You promised you wouldn't laugh if I'd say it, and then there you are. It's part of my training in virtual reality, which is becoming the norm around here. *[Laughter]*

Our ability to offer people opportunity clearly depends upon our ability to spread the fruits of our knowledge. In other words, our leadership depends upon our commitment to science, to technology, to research,

to learning. We have always revered science and its implicit promise of progress. We are in a way a whole nation of inventors and explorers and tinkerers. We believe in technology, and we are determined to pursue technology in all of its manifestations. These things seem to me to be deeply embedded in our national character and our national history. We also recognize that these benefits are far from abstract. For throughout our history, from the steam engine to the telegraph, from the assembly line to the microchip, our prosperity has surged forward on wave after wave after wave of technological change. Since World War II, innovation has been responsible for clearly as much as half of our national economic growth.

The private businesses represented here today will always be the most important investors in research and development. But throughout our history, we have recognized that Government, working in partnership with the private sector, does have a critical role to play.

The defense and space programs help make America the world's leader in aircraft, aerospace, and electronics. Because our troops are equipped with the world's most sophisticated weapons, our Nation is secure. The work of the National Institutes of Health led to new drugs and therapies that have made America a leader in biotechnology. And a unique partnership between Government, business, and university researchers spawned the Internet, a pathway for knowledge and creativity, the likes of which our parents could only have imagined, and some of us who are parents today can just barely imagine. *[Laughter]* Sales of products through on-line services will soar from \$200 million this year to \$4.8 billion in 1998.

Today, global competition and rapid change have made technology clearly more central to our future than ever before. And because it is so often difficult for individual firms to reap the benefits of discovery and innovation, the public sector must continue to play a role.

Since I became President, I have continued this commitment to invest in science and technology. Our comprehensive economic strategy began by reducing the deficit by a trillion dollars over 7 years, which lowered

the cost of capital and freed up funds for investment. But we strengthened our investments in basic science research. And we put in place pragmatic industry-led efforts such as the Commerce Department's advanced technology program, manufacturing extension programs, and our work to enhance market-led solutions to our Nation's environmental challenges.

Throughout our history, at least throughout modern history when we've been clearly aware of these scientific matters, this future and this kind of policy has been broadly supported by members of both parties. It has been a part of our national common ground, a part of our sense of who we are, what our security requires, and what will bring us the best future. Today that commitment is at risk in the great debate over balancing the Federal budget.

I have proposed a balanced budget plan that sustains our investment in scientific endeavors, in technology, in research and development. The plan now being considered by the Congress will cut vital research and development by a third and any number of other related endeavors by that much or more. We could have a balanced budget to show for it tomorrow, but a decade or a generation from now our Nation will be much the poorer for doing that.

At a time of real and crushing budget pressures, the Congress deserves credit for its commitment to balance the budget and to slow the rate of growth of medical inflation. But it is tempting to cut other things without considering what the consequences are, including investments in science and technology which may not have the biggest lobby here in Washington.

The future, it is often said, has no constituency. But the truth is, we must all be the constituency of the future. If we want a future in which the world's libraries are at every child's fingertips, in which gene therapy enables us to cure diseases like cystic fibrosis, in which a car can travel across the country on one tankful of gas with virtually no pollution, then we must strengthen, not weaken, our investments in science, technology, and research. We must sustain our universities, a critical national resource and still the envy of the entire world. We must

allow ourselves always to see the world through fresh eyes. We must never allow those who fear change to subvert progress. And we must resist these drastic cuts, for constant churning innovation is the key to economic growth and national strength in the 21st century.

If we're going to make real the promise of the American dream to all Americans, which would plainly do a lot to help us deal with the kind of racial difficulties that we began so bravely as a nation to come to grips with this last week, we have to go further in this area.

Those of us in this room who care about science and technology, all of us have a duty to ensure that every child has the chance to take part in the new information age. Technological literacy must become the standard in our country. Computers can enrich the education of any child but only if the child has access to a computer, good software, and a competent, good teacher who can help that child learn how to use it. Preparing children for a lifetime of computer use is just as essential today as teaching basic skills was a few years ago.

Over the past month I have been gratified that so many leaders of the high-tech industry have joined with us to launch a national effort to connect every classroom by the year 2000, a plan that rests upon four pillars: modern computers in every classroom accessible to all students; connections from every classroom to the incredible educational resources flowing throughout the world; teachers in every classroom who are trained to make the most of the technology; and a rich array of educational software and information resources.

Already, significant progress is being made. In California, a voluntary private effort will provide Internet access to every elementary and secondary school by the end of the decade and will wire one out of every five classrooms by the end of this year. That is an astonishing achievement led by private sector companies in California.

These goals are important to our future. And this balanced budget debate has to be seen in that context. It is a very good thing to balance the budget if we do it in a way that is consistent with our values and our

clear long-term goals of strengthening our economy, growing our middle class, shrinking our under class, keeping America the world's greatest home for entrepreneurs. If it's consistent with our values and our economic interests, that's what we ought to do. We can't do that if we destroy the public responsibility in these critical areas.

I, however, have to tell you I am basically optimistic, maybe because I am genetically programmed that way. *[Laughter]* We are going through sort of a tortured version of a scientific method now. It reminds me—I say tortured because, unlike the scientific method, it ignores the experiments of the past. *[Laughter]* But still, it's sort of like that.

And I'm reminded of what Winston Churchill said about the United States when we were trying to decide in the Congress whether to support the Lend-Lease Act and help Britain when Britain was alone in World War II. And there was a great question about whether President Roosevelt could pass the Lend-Lease Act through Congress because many thought it was a backdoor way of getting the United States into the war. And Mr. Churchill said, "I have great confidence in the judgment and the common sense of the American people and their leaders. They invariably do the right thing, after they have considered every other alternative." *[Laughter]*

So I urge you to inject some rigor into this scientific experimentation. I thank you for your achievements and your contributions. I do believe that the 21st century can be a golden age for all Americans and that we can help to lead the world to a new era of freedom and peace and prosperity—if we make the right decisions in this critical time of change.

Your very achievements, the example of your life work have increased the odds that we will do exactly that. And on behalf of all Americans, I thank you and congratulate you.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:54 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

The President's News Conference

October 19, 1995

The President. Good morning. The Congress is about to take some votes that I believe will move this country in the wrong direction. Before they do it, I want to urge them to think again. There's a right way to balance this budget and a wrong way. I strongly believe the Republicans in Congress are taking the wrong way.

On Medicare, the House is voting on a \$270 billion cut in Medicare that will eviscerate the health care system for our older Americans. It goes far beyond what is necessary to secure the Medicare Trust Fund. Our plan to secure the Medicare Trust Fund secures it for just as long as the Republican plan at less than half the cost and with far less burden on our seniors.

The House plan, by contrast, actually weakens existing law on waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare program, which is a serious problem. And therefore, it will undermine our efforts to save funds through cracking down on waste, fraud, and abuse, as the Attorney General has outlined. On the other hand, it increases costs on older Americans dramatically. That is the wrong way.

So my message to the Republicans is simple: I hope you will think again; I will not let you destroy Medicare; and I will veto this bill. I have to do that to protect the people of the United States and to protect the integrity of this program.

On taxes, just last night we learned from the Republicans' own Joint Committee on Taxation that more than half of the American people who live in the group earning under \$30,000 will pay more taxes if the Republican economic plan passes. Why? Because they have a \$43-billion tax hike targeted at working families. Now this doesn't count the cost to working families of the increases in college loans, the child support collection fees, the Medicare increases, the Medicaid increases, all told, over \$140 billion of taxes, fees, and other increases on the most vulnerable people in our country and on working families.

So again, I would say, think again. I won't let you raise taxes on working families \$48

billion. That is not the right way to balance the budget. It isn't fair, and it won't happen. These bills undermine our values, our values of supporting both work and family, our values of being responsible and creating opportunity. They are not necessary to balance the budget.

Meanwhile, Congress is lagging behind on its other business. For the budget this year—the fiscal year, as all of you know, ended 3 weeks ago, and they have still sent me only 3 of the 13 appropriations bills. Last year, all 13 were here and signed into law by the beginning of the fiscal year.

It's been 6 months since the Oklahoma City bombing killed 169 of our fellow Americans and 6 months since congressional leaders promised that they would pass the anti-terrorism legislation by Memorial Day. They still haven't passed the bill. They haven't even scheduled it for a final vote. I might add also, one of the important items in their contract which I did support, the line-item veto, has still not been passed by the Congress and sent to me. And perhaps most troubling of all, because they refuse to extend the debt limit, they are threatening to plunge our country into default for the first time in the entire history of the Republic. This would, of course, mean higher interest rates, which would increase the deficit we both want to reduce, and it would also lead to higher home mortgage costs for millions of homeowners whose mortgages are tied to Federal interest rates.

I was told this morning by the Council of Economic Advisers probably somewhere between 7 and 10 million homeowners have mortgages that are tied to Federal interest rates. So again, my message to Congress on this issue is simple: We must not play political games with the good faith and credit of the United States. Pass the debt limit, and I will sign it.

It's time for Congress to turn back from passing extreme measures that never will become law and instead to work with me for the American people to balance this budget in a way that advances our values and supports our interests. That is what we ought to do. We can still do that, it is what I still believe we will do.

1993 Budget

Now, I can only imagine what the first question is. [*Laughter*] Wait a minute, let me just say one thing. Before you ask this question, I want to say something about my speech—well, the two speeches I gave in which I made reference to the economic plan of 1993. If anything I said was interpreted by anybody to imply that I am not proud of that program, proud of the people who voted for it, or that I don't believe it was the right thing to do, then I shouldn't have said that, because I am very proud of it. I think it was absolutely the right thing to do. I am proud of the people in Congress who voted for it. And the results speak for themselves. After all, that program actually did reduce the deficit by \$1 trillion over 7 years. That program drove down interest rates. That program created an economic climate in which the American people were able to produce 7½ million new jobs, 2½ million new homeowners, a record number of new businesses, and put this country moving in the right direction.

So if I said anything which can be read in any other way, then I should not have said that. And I certainly did not mean to do that, and I accept responsibility for it, because I am very, very proud of what I did. And I have tried to make that clear in every talk I have made this year, and I reaffirm it to you here today—all of the parts of the program. We did the right thing for America, and I'm proud of it today, and I'm proud of the people who voted for it.

Q. Mr. President, did you mean to say what you said, that you regret having raised taxes as much as you did?

The President. What I said was—what I meant to say is, I think nobody enjoys raising taxes. I think our system works better when Democrats and Republicans work together to reach consensus, and I think it would work better now if we did. That's what I meant to say.

But I do not believe that when we had the decision to make and we had the vote to cast, I take full responsibility, proudly, for what we did. It was the right thing to do. I believe all the people who have heard me talk about it knew what I meant to say, and I'm proud of the Congress for voting for it. And if we hadn't done it, we'd really be in

a fix today. And I might say, the Republicans who criticize us obviously think we did the right thing since they're not trying to undo much of it at all.

Q. But did you raise taxes too much?

Medicare Legislation

Q. Mr. President, you said that you'd veto the Republican Medicare bill for \$270 billion worth of cuts. Your own Medicare bill is \$124 billion in cuts. Where do you see a compromise between the two? How far are you willing to go?

The President. Well, first of all, I think we have to draw a—I am willing to do what they want to do, which is to extend the life of the Medicare Trust Fund to 2006. That's what we both do. Now beyond that, I don't believe we ought to be raising costs on the elderly poor through the Medicare program and the far worse things that are in the Medicaid program. You know, the Medicaid program supplies the copays and the deductible for very poor elderly people, and they propose to stop doing that.

It's estimated we could lose a million seniors out of the Medicare program, and I just don't think we need to do that. We can balance the budget with the cuts that I have proposed, and that's what I think we ought to do. I believe that they are more than adequate to balance the budget and to secure the Medicare Trust Fund without really burning our seniors.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, slight change of subject. Would you send peacekeeping troops to Bosnia if we do not get congressional approval? And you have never stated that you would only keep them for one year. Your people have and the Cabinet has, but is that a flat commitment?

The President. Let me answer the question carefully. The reason I have never said that is that I wanted to define our mission and have the mission be defined in the way that we did in Haiti. We defined our mission in Haiti, and we said, okay, this is when we think we will complete our mission, and we did it. And then we said the United Nations

would complete its mission with the next Presidential election, which occurs early next year.

In Bosnia, I wanted to make sure that we had a clear notion of what our mission was. Yesterday, General Joulwan, who is our NATO Commander, came in with the national security team, and we had a very extended session about the plans that are now being developed, which, of course, cannot be finalized until we get a peace agreement, because the nature of the map and the nature of the agreement among the parties will determine in part the nature of the commitments that the United Nations and that NATO will have to make.

But our commanders believe we can complete our mission in a year. That's what they believe. Before I make that pledge to the American people, I want to know what the peace agreement is finally, and I want to have a very high level of confidence that I can make that commitment and keep it. But it looks like we're talking about a commitment in the nature—in the range of a year.

Q. Wait a minute. Would you go ahead, then, and send the troops, even if Congress does not approve?

The President. I am not going to lay down any of my constitutional prerogatives here today. I have said before and I will say again, I would welcome and I hope I get an expression of congressional support. I think it's important for the United States to be united in doing this. I believe that we had a very good meeting with the Speaker and Senator Dole and a large number of Congressmen, as you know, a couple of weeks ago. I expect that our people will be asked and will have to answer difficult questions; that's the job of the Congress. But I believe in the end, the Congress will support this operation.

1993 Budget

Q. Mr. President, may we take it—just a final followup on this—may we take it from what you said here today that what you meant to say on taxes was that while you raised them more than you would have liked to, that it was perhaps a mistake to say you raised them too much?

The President. If I said anything which implies that I think that we didn't do what

we should have done, given the choices we faced at the time, I shouldn't have said that.

My mother once said I should never give a talk after 7 p.m. at night, especially if I'm tired, and she sure turned out to be right is all I can say. [*Laughter*]

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, back on the subject of the deployment in Bosnia, many experts feel that by the very nature of a deployment, American troops would become targets for various groups who want to disrupt the situation. How do you prevent that? And having committed troops to Europe twice in this century because they got into a mess they couldn't resolve, why does the United States have to continue to come to Europe's rescue?

The President. Because now what we're trying to do is to avoid just what drug us into Europe. If you remember, I said we would not go into a situation in which we'd be in combat in Bosnia on one side of the conflict, nor would we be engaged with the United Nations mission because of the rules of engagement there, but that if we can make a peace, since NATO would have to be involved in implementing the peace agreement and assuring its success and we are the leaders of NATO, we would have to go into it. The reason we need to do this is to—precisely to avoid the kind of convulsive conflict with massive consequences that drug us into Europe twice before and got huge numbers of Americans killed in the defense of freedom and decency. I strongly believe we can do that.

Now one of the things we are concerned about, obviously, is that if a peace is made, even in good faith, there may be people who don't like the peace. And we don't want—not only the United States but any of the NATO soldiers or any of our allies not in NATO who will be taking part in this, and we expect a significant number of non-NATO members to contribute—we don't want anybody to be targets, and we've given quite a bit of thought to that. And as this plan proceeds, we'll see what happens.

Let me just emphasize—first of all, first things first: The leaders of the three countries have agreed to come here to the United States to meet in Ohio at the end of this

month. We are very pleased by that, and that is the next big step. The most important thing, the thing that will reduce danger to everybody, is if these leaders will agree to an honorable peace and then do everything they can in good faith to keep it.

I must tell you, I'm somewhat encouraged by the fact that the cease-fire seems to be taking hold. The incidents seem to be dropping throughout Bosnia. There seems to be an atmosphere of mutual commitment taking hold there, and we obviously hope that can be sustained.

Budget Negotiations

Q. Mr. President, yesterday you said you were perhaps genetically optimistic by nature that there would in the end be a deal when all is said and done. But Speaker Gingrich keeps saying he's willing to cooperate, but he's not willing to compromise on his bottom line in the tax cut, the Medicare cuts, and all these other issues. Why are you optimistic that there still will be a deal?

The President. Because this is America and people usually do the right thing, and because we've been around here for a long, long time. Now, I know that at least in reading between the lines, it appears that the extreme conservative wing in the House continues to move the Speaker back and affect what happens in the Senate and make the possibility of honorable compromise more remote. But I believe in the end, that's the right thing for the country.

My goal—I will say again, and what I try to capture from time to time, sometimes not too well, as we see, is that if you have two people who both make a good-faith effort at reaching a common stated goal, the balanced budget in this case, and they have different approaches, if they get together in genuine honesty and openness—I think there's a way for me to meet their stated objectives, which is a balanced budget in 7 years with a family tax cut, and I think they want a capital gains tax cut and extending the Medicare Trust Fund until 2006, and for them to meet our stated goals, which is to maintain our commitments to our investments in education and our obligations to the elderly through the Medicare program and to the elderly and our children, the disabled people in America

through the Medicaid program, and our obligations to the environment and to technology and to the things that will make our economy grow—we can both meet our objectives. And if we do it in good faith, we might wind up with a budget that is better than either one of us proposed. That's what I hope will happen, and I'm going to leave the door open for that. But meanwhile, my job is to protect the American people if something happens that I think is very wrong. And I think the Medicare budget is wrong for America.

Presidential Commission on Race

Q. Mr. President, the University of Texas speech included several challenges on race to blacks and whites, alike. How do you plan to further the conversation? Are there any next steps? What are your thoughts about a Presidential commission on race?

The President. Well, as you know, I received a letter signed by a number of House Members asking for that. And I have that and a number of other ideas under consideration. After I spoke at the University of Texas, and after so many came here to Washington in that march in what I thought was such a profoundly moving spirit, an open spirit and is clearly a manifestation of a desire to assume more responsibilities for themselves, for their families, their communities, and to reach out to the white community and their fellow Americans and to try to figure out how we can work together, I think that there is a big responsibility on me and on others to carry forward with that. And as you know, in the last few days I've been quite active with previously scheduled events. But we are turning our attention now very carefully to what should be done to follow up. I think we owe the country a followup, and I'm going to do my best to do it right.

I'll take one more question. Mara [Mara Liasson, National Public Radio].

Budget Negotiations

Q. Mr. President, just to follow up. This, I believe, is the first time you've said that you think you can reach a balanced budget in 7 years. How would the Republicans' plans need to alter so that you could reach that goal and still meet your——

The President. Well, I think we could reach it in 7 years; I think we could reach it in 8 years; I think we could reach it in 9 years. Our budget has moved forward from 10 to 9 years just because of the improvements in the economy and our deficit reduction package since we started. So we're between 7 and 9 now.

So I think it's obvious—what would have to happen is that we would have to find a formula in which we would monitor the reduction of the deficit as we go toward balance because under either of these programs, no one can predict with any exactitude—I mean, no American corporation has a 7-year budget. They may have a 7-year plan or a 10-year plan or a 5-year plan, but they don't have budgets in that sense, because you can't project what all will happen.

So we have to have sort of checks along the way to make sure we're on our downward target. And then we'd have to find a way to take care of these concerns that I have repeatedly expressed. I do not want us to make education less available. I don't want us to have retrenchment on technology and research. I do not want us to burden, unnecessarily, people who barely have enough money to get by on, who depend on Medicare and Medicaid. I don't want to damage the university hospitals, the children's hospitals, and the urban and rural hospital network of this country with what I think the Medicare budget will do. I don't want to damage the environment. And I do not want to tolerate a \$48-billion tax increase on working families with incomes under \$30,000. That's wrong.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 103d news conference began at 11:29 a.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.

Message to the Congress Transmitting Budget Deferrals October 19, 1995

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report three deferrals of budgetary resources, totaling \$122.8 million.

These deferrals affect the International Security Assistance program, and the Departments of Health and Human Services and State.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
October 19, 1995.

**Letter to Senator Edward M.
Kennedy on the "Employment Non-
Discrimination Act"**

October 19, 1995

Dear Ted:

I am writing in regard to the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, which you and Senator Jeffords have reintroduced in the current session of Congress.

As you know, discrimination in employment on the basis of sexual orientation is currently legal in 41 states. Men and women in those states may be fired from their jobs solely because of their sexual orientation, even when it has no bearing on their job performance. Those who face this kind of job discrimination have no legal recourse, in either our state or federal courts. This is wrong.

Individuals should not be denied a job on the basis of something that has no relationship to their ability to perform their work. Sadly, as the Labor and Human Resources Committee documented last year, this kind of job discrimination is not rare. Cases of job discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation are seen in every area of our country.

The Employment Non-Discrimination Act, however, is careful to apply some exemptions in certain areas. I understand that your bill provides an exemption for small businesses, the Armed Forces, and religious organizations, including schools and other educational institutions that are substantially controlled or supported by religious organizations. This provision, which I believe is essential, respects the deeply held religious beliefs of many Americans.

Moreover, your bill specifically prohibits preferential treatment on the basis of sexual orientation, including quotas. It also does not require employers to provide special benefits.

The bill, therefore, appears to answer all the legitimate objections previously raised against it, while ensuring that Americans, regardless of their sexual orientation, can find and keep their jobs based on their ability and the quality of their work. The Employment Non-Discrimination Act is designed to protect the rights of all Americans to participate in the job market without fear of unfair discrimination. I support it.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

**Executive Order 12977—
Interagency Security Committee**

October 19, 1995

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and in order to enhance the quality and effectiveness of security in and protection of buildings and facilities in the United States occupied by Federal employees for nonmilitary activities ("Federal facilities"), and to provide a permanent body to address continuing government-wide security for Federal facilities, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Establishment. There is hereby established within the executive branch the Interagency Security Committee ("Committee"). The Committee shall consist of: (a) the Administrator of General Services ("Administrator");

(b) representatives from the following agencies, appointed by the agency heads:

- (1) Department of State;
- (2) Department of the Treasury;
- (3) Department of Defense;
- (4) Department of Justice;
- (5) Department of the Interior;
- (6) Department of Agriculture;
- (7) Department of Commerce;
- (8) Department of Labor;
- (9) Department of Health and Human Services;
- (10) Department of Housing and Urban Development;
- (11) Department of Transportation;
- (12) Department of Energy;
- (13) Department of Education;
- (14) Department of Veterans Affairs;

(15) Environmental Protection Agency;
 (16) Central Intelligence Agency; and
 (17) Office of Management and Budget;
 (c) the following individuals or their designees:

(1) the Director, United States Marshals Service;

(2) the Assistant Commissioner of the Federal Protective Service of the Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration ("Assistant Commissioner");

(3) the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs; and

(4) the Director, Security Policy Board; and

(d) such other Federal employees as the President shall appoint.

Sec. 2. Chair. The Committee shall be chaired by the Administrator, or the designee of the Administrator.

Sec. 3. Working Groups. The Committee is authorized to establish interagency working groups to perform such tasks as may be directed by the Committee.

Sec. 4. Consultation. The Committee may consult with other parties, including the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, to perform its responsibilities under this order, and, at the discretion of the Committee, such other parties may participate in the working groups.

Sec. 5. Duties and Responsibilities. (a) The Committee shall: (1) establish policies for security in and protection of Federal facilities;

(2) develop and evaluate security standards for Federal facilities, develop a strategy for ensuring compliance with such standards, and oversee the implementation of appropriate security measures in Federal facilities; and

(3) take such actions as may be necessary to enhance the quality and effectiveness of security and protection of Federal facilities, including but not limited to:

(A) encouraging agencies with security responsibilities to share security-related intelligence in a timely and cooperative manner;

(B) assessing technology and information systems as a means of providing cost-effective improvements to security in Federal facilities;

(C) developing long-term construction standards for those locations with threat lev-

els or missions that require blast resistant structures or other specialized security requirements;

(D) evaluating standards for the location of, and special security related to, day care centers in Federal facilities; and

(E) assisting the Administrator in developing and maintaining a centralized security data base of all Federal facilities.

Sec. 6. Agency Support and Cooperation.

(a) *Administrative Support.* To the extent permitted by law and subject to the availability of appropriations, the Administrator, acting by and through the Assistant Commissioner, shall provide the Committee such administrative services, funds, facilities, staff and other support services as may be necessary for the performance of its functions under this order.

(b) *Cooperation.* Each executive agency and department shall cooperate and comply with the policies and recommendations of the Committee issued pursuant to this order, except where the Director of Central Intelligence determines that compliance would jeopardize intelligence sources and methods. To the extent permitted by law and subject to the availability of appropriations, executive agencies and departments shall provide such support as may be necessary to enable the Committee to perform its duties and responsibilities under this order.

(c) *Compliance.* The Administrator, acting by and through the Assistant Commissioner, shall be responsible for monitoring Federal agency compliance with the policies and recommendations of the Committee.

Sec. 7. Judicial Review. This order is intended only to improve the internal management of the Federal Government, and is not intended, and should not be construed, to create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by a party against the United States, its agencies, its officers, or its employees.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
 October 19, 1995.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:55 p.m., October 20, 1995]

NOTE: This Executive order was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 20, and it will be published in the *Federal Register* on October 24.

**Remarks at the Opening Session of
the Midwest Economic Conference
in Columbus, Ohio**

October 20, 1995

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Mayor. President Gee, you were kind enough to point out that when Ohio State was playing Notre Dame, I was meeting with His Holiness the Pope. I hope that at election time the people of Ohio will remember that I single-handedly prevented papal intervention in that game. [Laughter] And when they say, what did Bill Clinton ever do for Ohio, you'll have an answer. [Laughter] These are—lightning is about to come through that window right now. [Laughter] Forgive me, God.

These are very good days for Ohio, not only because the Buckeyes are winning on the football field and Cleveland has become the comeback team of the ages, winning 100 games in a shortened season, and is now in the World Series but because the economy of Ohio has come back. You can drive through this city, you see its vibrancy, its aliveness, its beauty, and the strength that the university and the other parts of the community here give to what is going on. It's very exuberant. And you see this throughout the Middle West.

I want to make a few comments today, if I might, about how what we're doing here relates to what is going on back in Washington. But let me, first, just follow up on some things the Vice President said.

Economic policy is very important to this administration. And when I became President, I determined to do everything I could to put economic policy beyond partisan politics, to forge a partnership between our Government and the private sector, to try to support cooperative efforts between business and labor, and to try to share ideas and work together with people at the State and local level, in other words, to try to move America together toward realizing its maximum economic potential in creating jobs, in raising

incomes, in fulfilling the dreams of the American people.

And I believe that the results of the last 2½ years point to the proposition that every administration from here on out in the foreseeable future should seek to put economic policy beyond partisan politics and the traditional wrangling that goes on in Washington, because that is a very important part of our national security and what it means to be an American.

Everyone knows now that we're in a period of profound change, moving from the cold war to the global village, from the industrial era to the information and technology era, when even in a State like Ohio, you know, even our industries are becoming more information- and technology-driven. The Midwest is emerging from years of economic trouble with a hopeful future built around a very, very diversified economy.

At the turn of the century, half of the people in this country worked or lived on farms. At the midpoint of the century, 4 out of 10 Americans worked in factories. By the end of the century, just 5 years from now, half of all Americans will be knowledge workers. We have to find ways to harness this change to make the American dream available to all of our people, to keep our country the strongest nation in the world, and to help people strengthen their families and their communities. That is the great challenge now: How are we going to harness the change so it benefits everyone?

We are engaged in a great debate now over balancing the Federal budget. The real issue is not whether to balance the Federal budget. We now have broad agreement on that after several years of exploding the deficit. The real question is how we should do it. I believe we should try to do it as much as possible based on common sense and the way it would be done if the decision were being made in a town meeting in Ohio instead of through the glare of national publicity and partisan filters in Washington, DC.

We ought to do it in a way that guarantees maximum opportunity for every American, that preserves and strengthens our families, that recognizes that if you live in a country that is a community, it means you have obligations to other people and not just yourself.

We ought to recognize what those obligations are, to our parents and to our children, to those who through no fault of their own need our help. We ought to be building our great middle class and shrinking the under class, not the other way around. And I will say again: We must keep our Nation the strongest nation in the world.

So all the decisions that we make about this budget ought to mirror those goals. And everything we talk about today about the Midwest economy or what we found about the economy of the Pacific Northwest or the economy of the South when we had the other regional conferences, all the things we do should be consistent with helping Americans in every region fulfill their aspirations. That's what I think we ought to be doing.

You heard the Vice President say that the American economy is on the move. In the last 2½ years, we've not only seen 7½ million new jobs but a record number of new small businesses within that time period, 2½ million new homeowners, the smallest misery index—the combined rate of unemployment and inflation—in 25 years, a huge expansion in trade. We have seen our exports go from increasing 4 percent to 10 percent to 16 percent in the last 3 years. And the result of all that has been a very good movement for the American economy. It has been fueled in no small measure by the fact that the deficit has been reduced from \$290 billion a year to \$160 billion while increasing our investment in education, in technology, in research, and in partnerships to help promote the economic strength of the United States. So I feel very good about that.

I have to say that, in the aftermath of the great march in Washington earlier this week, there is also kind of a renewal of common sense and shared values in dealing with social problems in the United States. We have—a lot of people don't know this, but generally throughout the country, the crime rate is down, the welfare rolls are down, the food stamp rolls are down, the poverty rate is down, the teen pregnancy rate is down. Now, these problems are still very profound in our country, but the American people are reasserting responsibility for themselves, their families, their communities. They're moving this country in the right direction.

And I believe that the work we have tried to do with the crime bill—and I want to thank your mayor and all the mayors for working with us on that in such a bipartisan fashion—to put more police officers on the street, to have more prevention programs, to deal with the problems of our young people and try to keep them from flowering into lives of crime; the work we've done on helping States reform welfare and health care on a State-by-State basis; the work we did to try to help families that are working for modest incomes by lowering their taxes and passing the family leave law—I think these things have supported this great movement by the American people to try to bring our country back together and move our country forward.

And that is the sort of thing that we ought to be trying to accelerate in this budget debate. And we certainly shouldn't be doing anything to get in the way of what you're doing out here and what the American people are trying to do in their own lives and their own communities. That is the kind of balanced budget I want.

I have proposed a balanced budget that balances the budget in 9 years, secures the Medicare Trust Fund, continues to invest more in education and research and technology because I think that's important to our future, and cuts out hundreds of other programs without unduly crippling either the Medicare or the Medicaid program and hurting the people who depend on them and without the kind of tax increases on working people that are in the congressional majority plan.

Yesterday I know you all saw that the House of Representatives voted for the Medicare plan that reduces projected expenditures and Medicare by \$270 billion over the next 7 years. And I think that's too much because it will hurt working people too much, hurt the seniors too much and their children, who will have to pay more to help their parents and will have less to educate their children. I think that is a mistake. And you should know that the plan I proposed, which has less than half that many cuts, has exactly the same strengthening effect on the Medicare Trust Fund. So we're going to argue about that. But I think it's a mistake.

We have—this city and many others have huge, huge, interests and investments in the health care system of this country. University medical hospitals, children's hospitals, medical research facilities, urban hospitals dealing with large numbers of poor people, rural hospitals, all of those folks are going to be hurt quite significantly if we just jerk \$450 billion out of the health care system over the next 7 years with no sense of exactly how these budget targets will be met.

And of course, a lot of our most fragile elderly people, under this plan, will be hurt the worst; a lot of older people living on \$300 or \$400 a month will pay among the largest increases because of the way the plan is structured. I believe that that is inconsistent with our values. And since it is not necessary to balance the budget, I think it's a mistake to do it.

I think it's a mistake to single out education and the environment for deep and devastating cuts. We shouldn't be reducing key programs and environmental protections. I have—as I said, we have already eliminated, under the Vice President's leadership in the reinventing Government plan, we've eliminated hundreds of Government programs—hundreds. We've cut hundreds more. We have reduced the size of Government. There are 163,000 fewer people working for your Government today than there were the day I became President. Next year the Federal Government will be the smallest it's been since John Kennedy was President—and listen to this—as a percentage of the civilian work force, the smallest it's been since 1933. There is no more big Government.

The issue is not maintaining some big bloated Government. We have reduced the size of this Government more rapidly than ever before. We've eliminated 16,000 pages of regulations. We've got some more to do on that, and I'm sure we'll hear from some of you about that today. And I'm more than happy to help with that. But we shouldn't undermine the fundamental ability of the United States to educate our young people, to invest in education and technology, to maintain these health care programs at an appropriate level, to protect our common environment. These are commonsense commit-

ments that are important to achieving a good future. And I just believe it's a mistake.

I also think it is a terrible mistake to raise taxes on working families with incomes under \$30,000. I mean, after all, these people are the ones that we want to reward; we want to say, "Don't go on welfare. Work." What we did was the reverse. We dramatically increased the family tax credit, the earned-income tax credit, so that I would be able to say to you by next year, any American with a child in the home working 40 hours a week will not be in poverty. There will never be an economic incentive to be on welfare instead of work because we will not tax people into poverty; we will use the tax system to lift them out of poverty. That is a good, commonsense national goal.

So I say to you, that is what I'm fighting for. I don't want a big partisan fight in Washington, but I am going to stand up for the values that I think would be embedded in this budget decision if it were being made in this room by the people who live in this community. That's my simple test. If the budget decisions were being made by people in this room who live in this community, who reflect a broad cross-section of the people who work here, the people who go to Ohio State as students, the people who teach here, the people who work in the hospitals, the people who work in city hall, the people who do all these things, I believe they would come up with a budget far more like mine than the one that is working its way through Congress. If the crowd was divided equally between Republicans and Democrats, if there were more Republicans than Democrats in the crowd, that's what I believe would happen. And so, I'm going to do my best to do that.

Now, there are some who say that if I stand up for these commonsense values, that they'll just shut the Government down and, for the first time in the history of the Republic, refuse to honor our national debt. Well, I just showed up there 2½ years ago, so I didn't have as much as some of them did to do with running up the debt in the first place. *[Laughter]* But it does seem to me that if we're going to be good neighbors and good citizens, we ought to pay our bills. And I can't

imagine that the United States would not pay its debt.

Let me say, again, this just sounds like a rhetorical debate, but this could have practical consequences in the Midwest. If we don't pay our bills, our interest rates on our own debt will go up. If it goes up a tenth of a percent, it adds \$40 billion to the deficit over 10 years. What does that mean? No balanced budget, even with this plan, just by letting—or even with their plan, it means no balanced budget if you let the debt limit expire.

I also want you to know that there are \$400 billion worth of mortgages held by between 7 and 10 million American homeowners that are tied to Federal interest rates. So if we don't pay our debt on time, if we let this debt limit expire, you have friends and neighbors with home mortgages tied to the Federal interest rates whose monthly mortgage payment could go up. This is not a good idea, either.

We do not need to overly politicize this debate. We need to settle down and pass a budget that will bring our budget into balance, based on commonsense values. That is my commitment.

So I will say to you again, I cannot in good conscience sign a budget that cuts thousands of young, poor children out of getting in the Head Start program, or that makes it harder for young people to go to Ohio State because we raise the interest rates on their loan or charge them fees, or that makes it harder for single mothers out there really working hard to raise their kids because we're going to charge them a bigger fee for collecting the child support they're legally due, or that says to a senior citizen who is living on \$300 a month, we're not going to help you with your copays and deductible anymore, even if you drop out of the Medicare system. I can't do that.

I signed on to protect the fundamental interests of the American people, and it has nothing to do with partisan politics. I'm just not going to do it; it's not right.

But there are other economic issues. We gave out the scientific medals—the Vice President and I did—gave out the annual medals for science and technology this week. Do you know that nine of the Nobel Prize

winners this year—nine of the Nobel Prize winners in science and technology, of those nine, seven were Americans. Seven were Americans, seven. And all seven benefited in their work from research grants from the United States Government.

Now, this is a small part of our budget. I cannot in good conscience watch us cut 30 percent of our research and development and basic science budget when I know it is critical to our economic future and I know the Japanese just voted to double theirs. They just voted to double theirs. We shouldn't cut ours by 30 percent. That's not right. It defies common sense. It's not necessary.

Secretary Brown—is he on this panel? Secretary Brown got back from China at 11:30 last night. The Commerce Department is a central reason for why exports have increased 4 percent, 10 percent, and 16 percent in the last 3 years. Ohio needs that. That's a good thing for you. The Middle West needs that. Michigan, a State a long way from Mexico, is like the fourth or fifth biggest exporter to Mexico. We've got a lot of people from Michigan here today. It would be a mistake for us to shut down the operations of the Commerce Department and to undermine the work they're doing in technology, especially to help people who lost their defense contracts but are looking for ways to put all these technological benefits to work in the post-cold-war world. It is not necessary to balance the budget, and it would be wrong.

It would be a mistake to cut back on education and training when so many people are having to change jobs more rapidly. We are going to have to redefine security. The most important initiative we've got up there in the Congress today, arguably, is the one that Secretary Reich and I and Secretary Riley have pushed so hard to collapse a lot of these education and training programs and create a large pool so that anybody who loses a job or anybody on welfare can just get a voucher, instead of having to figure out how to get in the Government program, and take it to the nearest community college and immediately begin to get in a program that will give them a skill that will lead to a good job.

This is a practical thing. This has nothing to do with partisan politics. Half the community college board members in America are Republicans. This is not a partisan deal. This is the difference between the way Washington looks at the world and the way the world works on the ground where you live.

So I say to you, my fellow Americans, look what's happened in the Midwest. Look at the renaissance that's occurred here, the resurgence of manufacturing, the infusion of high technology, the strength of agriculture still in this region, something that's often overlooked—this is a huge agricultural region for our country—and the way this region is doing compared to the rest of the country and compared to the rest of the world.

All I want to do is to pass a balanced budget that will strengthen our economy, that will continue the good things that all of you are doing, and that doesn't get in the way of our fundamental values but permits them to continue to advance. That is my commitment. And I don't want to see, after all the progress of the last few years, I don't want to see us get in the way of what we have to do.

And let me just mention, there are three or four things I think we have to do. I think we have to accelerate our ability to innovate. I think we have to accelerate our ability to give people a lifetime of educational opportunity, starting with young children and going through adults who need retraining throughout their lives. I think if we're going to have a tax cut, it ought to be focused on childrearing and education, helping people to finance their education and training. That ought to be the emphasis; there can be other things in it, but we ought to help that. And we ought to pass this "GI bill for America's workers." I think we ought to do some more for small businesses and for the areas that have been left behind, either in inner cities or rural areas. We began that in the last 2 years, but we ought to do more.

In the last 2 years, we also helped to bail out a lot of the pension systems in the country that were in trouble; last December, we passed a bill that saved 8½ million pensioners their pensions. We now have a bill working through Congress that would make it much easier for small businesses to take out retirement plans for themselves and their

employees. That would be a huge deal. Most of the new jobs are being created by small businesses now. It's much more difficult for small business to provide for health care and retirement and things like that than it is for bigger business or for Government. So I'm hoping that this is one bill we'll have strong bipartisan support on to help.

The last point I want to make is this: I went to the University of Texas earlier this week and gave a speech about race in America. The racial and ethnic diversity of this country is one of the two or three most important assets we have in the global economy. If we can prove we can have a democracy that is a multiracial, multiethnic democracy, where people work together, get along and are honest with each other, we are going to do very, very well in the 21st century. We are going to do very, very well.

That's the last point I want to make to you. We have got to—whether on this issue or any other, we have to learn as Americans to be honest with each other, both in what we say and in how well we listen. We've got to bridge these gaps. Most of the problems we have in this country today, most of the challenges we have are not ideological, they are practical. There is no reason in the wide world to let the country be split in two over most of the real challenges we face. They are practical problems, and they are human problems.

And since I believe most people are good people and most people share the same values, if we learn to speak more clearly and more honestly, if we learn to listen more openly and we learn to sort of leave our ideological blinders at the door, I believe that the next 50 years, even though the United States will not have the same percentage of wealth in the world we had in the last 50 years, in the next 50 years we can have a better life for Americans and in profound ways we can have a more positive influence on the world, because we can prove that all the things other people say they believe in and say they want, we actually are living and doing. That is my goal. And today I want us to focus on what we're doing here in the Middle West and what more we can do to help you to achieve those goals more quickly.

Thank you, and thank you for coming.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 10:10 a.m. in the Fawcett Center Dining Room at Ohio State University. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Gregory Lashutka of Columbus and E. Gordon Gee, president, Ohio State University.

Remarks to the Community at Ohio State University in Columbus

October 20, 1995

Thank you, Holly. Thank you, Dr. Gee. Thank you, Richard. And thank you, Mr. Vice President. Ladies and gentlemen, when we came here in 1992, I knew that if I could be elected President that Al Gore would be the most influential and positive Vice President in American history, and he has been exactly that. And I am very proud of him.

I am delighted to be back at Ohio State, delighted to be here when you're on the verge of such an incredible successful football season, when Cleveland is on the verge of starting the World Series, and I know you're proud of that.

I have so many people in our administration from Ohio; the United States Treasurer, Mary Ellen Withrow; the Federal Railroad Administrator, Jolene Molitoris; most important, my personal photographer, Sharon Farmer, over here, was the vice president of the OSU student body when she was a student. I'm glad to be here with her.

I will be very brief. You've waited a long time, and it's cold, but I want to make a few points to you. I believe that my first responsibility is to guarantee you the best possible future. I want the 21st century to be a time when every American has the chance to live up to the fullest of his or her God-given abilities. I want America to be the strongest force for freedom and peace and decency and prosperity in the entire world. I want your life to be exciting and wonderful and hopeful. And in order to do that, we have to have a strong economy; we have to have a Government that works, that is smaller and less bureaucratic but still fulfills our basic values, giving people the chance to make to most of their own lives, strengthening families, building up communities, helping people, the elderly, the poor children, those who, through no fault of their own, need some

help to get along in life. This is part of having a good society.

This country is in much better shape than it was 2½ years ago. We are coming back. We have 7½ million more jobs, millions of more small businesses, the so-called misery index, the combination of unemployment and inflation, is at its lowest point in 25 years. We are moving in the right direction. And we see the American people coming back together and reasserting a sense of responsibility for themselves and their families and their communities, responsibility in a personal way. The welfare rolls are down; the food stamp rolls are down; the poverty rate is down; the crime rate is down; the teen pregnancy rate is down. And community service through things like AmeriCorps, the national service program, is up. This country is moving in the right direction.

We are facing a challenge today in Washington that is a very important one. We do need to balance the budget. When I became President, I was worried that the debt of this country was going to hang over your future like a dark cloud and make your future less than it ought to be. And in 3 years, we took the deficit from \$290 billion a year down to \$160 billion, the biggest drop in American history.

I want to balance the Federal budget. That is not the question. The question is, how shall we do it? What is the honorable way? What do we need to do? If you want the kind of future that I believe you do, we have to invest, as well as cut. We have to guarantee that we have enough to educate all of our people to the fullest of their abilities. We have to guarantee that we have enough to protect our environment. We have to guarantee that we have enough to protect the Medicare and Medicaid of our seniors and our poorest children and the disabled. We have to guarantee that.

And we have to guarantee that we can maintain America's leadership in the world. In just a few days, Ohio will become the center of the world's attention for quite another reason, when the heads of Bosnia and Croatia and Serbia come to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base to try to make peace in Bosnia.

And I have to tell you that—I have to say one sad thing today. A very distinguished

graduate of Ohio State University, Joe Kruzal, was one of the three Americans who was killed in Bosnia recently, working for that elusive peace. But he served his country well. You can be proud of him. And when they come here to Ohio and the world looks at Ohio, it will be happening because America has been able to lead the world toward peace, from the Middle East to Northern Ireland, to Haiti, to Bosnia. This is important. It matters. It's a big part of your future.

What I want to say to you is this: So many of these things that I am trying to do should not have much to do with partisan politics. It is a part of our basic value structure that we believe people should be able to strengthen their families and make the most of their own lives and protect their parents and their children and protect our environment and make sure it's going to be around for our grandchildren and our grandchildren's grandchildren. That ought to be what America is all about. It shouldn't be a partisan issue.

I have tried very much to work with this Congress, and I will continue to try to do that. But I will not tolerate raising the costs of student loans and student scholarships and cutting out opportunities.

I do not believe America would be stronger if we denied tens of thousands of young children the chance to be in the Head Start program. I do not believe America will be stronger if we deny poor school districts the chance to have small classes and computers in their schools. I do not believe America will be stronger if we wreck the ability of the National Government to provide for clean air and clean water and safe drinking water and pure food. I do not believe that.

I do not believe America will be stronger if we say to the elderly in this country who have worked their entire lives, "We don't really care anymore what happens to you in your health care. It's all right with us if some State tells you that if you or your husband or your wife have to go into a nursing home, before they can get any help from the Government, you've got to clean out your bank account; you've got to sell your car; you've got to sell your home." That's not the kind of America I want to live in, and I do not believe we will be stronger if we do that.

And I know we won't be stronger if we are not given the ability to stand up for basic decency and peace and freedom and prosperity around the world, if we are not given the ability to help to lead the way toward peace in Bosnia and Northern Ireland and the Middle East and Haiti and these other places.

This is what America is all about. And what I want to tell you is, if you look at the future, there is no nation in the world as well-positioned as the United States for the 21st century. All we have to do is to remember our basic values. And all I ask you to do today is to do the following: Number one, ask yourself, what do I have at stake in this debate for a balanced budget? I need the budget balanced, because I don't want a big debt on my future and my children's future. But it has to be done in the right way so that we can protect education and health care and the environment and the leadership of the United States in the world, because that's a big part of what I want.

And I want to leave you with this last thought as you look at your future. On Monday, nearly a million people gathered in Washington, DC, in a remarkable, remarkable march. And they had a simple message: We want to take responsibility for ourselves, for our families, and for our communities. But we want the rest of America to join hands with us in making this great country what it ought to be.

So I ask you to do one last thing. Look around this crowd today. We are a multiracial, multiethnic country. In a global village where people relate to each other across national lines, nothing—nothing—could give us a greater asset for the 21st century than our racial and ethnic diversity. It is a godsend. It is a godsend.

But all the surveys show, of public opinion, when people are called personally and asked in the privacy of their home, that there are still great differences in the way we view the world based on our racial or ethnic background. And even on our college campuses today, there are too many people whose lives are too segregated.

And so I want to repeat to you what I said at the University of Texas to the students there earlier this week. Make sure—make

sure that you have taken the time to really know and care about and understand somebody who is of a different race. Make sure you have told them the truth about how you feel. Make sure you have listened carefully to how they feel, and make sure you have done what you could in your way personally to bring your community together.

I am telling you, there are a lot of days when I wish I were your age, looking to the future that I think you'll have. It can be a great and beautiful thing. But we have got to go there together. And we have got to go there consistent with the values that made this country great. We can harness all this technology. We can harness all these changes to your benefit, to make your life the most exciting life any generation of Americans ever had. But you have to help us. You've got to stand up for what you believe. You've got to insist that we do it right. I will veto, if I have to, any attempt to mortgage your future. I will not let it happen. But you have to help me claim your future. That's something only you can do. I want you to do it.

I'm honored to be here with you today. I wish you well tomorrow and for the rest of your lives.

God bless you, and thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:07 p.m. at the Oval Mall. In his remarks, he referred to Holly Smith, student trustee, Ohio State University Board of Trustees, and actor and comedian Richard Lewis, OSU alumnus.

Digest of Other White House Announcements

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

October 15

In the morning, the President traveled to Hartford, CT. Following his arrival at Bradley International Airport, he greeted a group of young people helping to combat teenage smoking.

In the evening, the President traveled to Austin, TX.

October 16

In the morning, the President traveled to Dallas, TX, and in the evening, he traveled to Los Angeles, CA.

The President announced his intention to appoint Natalie Cohen to be a member of the Advisory Committee on the Arts of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

The White House announced that the President will meet at the White House with President Soeharto of Indonesia on October 27.

The White House announced that the President congratulated Armstrong World Industries' Building Products Operation and Corning Telecommunications Products Division as recipients of the 1995 Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award.

October 17

In the morning, the President traveled to San Antonio, TX, and in the evening, he traveled to Houston, TX. Later in the evening, the President returned to Washington, DC.

October 18

In the evening, the President traveled to Baltimore, MD, where he attended a fund-raising dinner at a private residence. He then returned to Washington, DC.

The President announced his intention to appoint A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr., to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

The White House announced that the President and President Jacques Chirac of France have agreed to reschedule President Chirac's November 3d state visit at the White House for February 1, 1996.

October 19

In the morning, the President had a working visit with President Thomas Klestil of Austria.

In the evening, the President attended the Africare reception at the Washington Hilton Hotel.

The President announced his intention to renominate Lottie L. Shackelford to be the small business designate on the Overseas Private Investment Corporation Board of Directors.

The President announced his intention to appoint Vigdor L. Teplitz to the Scientific and Policy Advisory Committee of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

October 20

In the morning, the President traveled to Columbus, OH, and in the afternoon, he traveled to Des Moines, IA.

In the evening, the President attended the Iowa Jefferson-Jackson Dinner at the Veterans Memorial Auditorium.

**Nominations
Submitted to the Senate**

The following list does not include promotions of members of the Uniformed Services, nominations to the Service Academies, or nominations of Foreign Service officers.

Submitted October 18

Nina Gershon,
of New York, to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, vice Leonard D. Wexler, retired.

Barbara S. Jones,
of New York, to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of New York, vice Kenneth Conboy, resigned.

John Thomas Marten,
of Kansas, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Kansas, vice Patrick F. Kelly, retired.

Submitted October 19

Arthur L. Money,
of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, vice Clark G. Fiester.

Submitted October 20

Nanette K. Laughrey,
of Missouri, to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern and Western Districts of Missouri, vice Joseph E. Stevens, Jr., retired.

Lottie Lee Shackelford,
of Arkansas, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 1998 (reappointment).

**Checklist
of White House Press Releases**

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

Released October 16

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the 1995 Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Awards

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing the upcoming visit of President Soeharto of Indonesia

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing Turkey's postponement of the visit of President Suleyman Demirel of Turkey

Released October 18

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry, Assistant to the President for Science and Technology Jack Gibbons, and National Economic Adviser Laura D'Andrea Tyson

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on treatment of prisoners by the Nigerian military regime

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the cloture vote on the Helms/Burton legislation on Cuba

Announcement of nomination for U.S. District Judges for the Eastern District and the Southern District of New York and the District of Kansas

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the postponement of the state visit of President Jacques Chirac of France

Released October 19

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Deputy National Security Adviser Samuel Berger on the President's visit to New York City

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing the President's intention to veto Medicare legislation

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing the President's letter to Senator Edward M. Kennedy on the proposed "Employment Non-Discrimination Act"

Released October 20

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the postponement of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee business meeting

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the resignation of NATO Secretary General Willy Claus

Announcement of nomination for a U.S. District Judge for the Eastern and Western Districts of Missouri

**Acts Approved
by the President**

NOTE: No acts approved by the President were received by the Office of the Federal Register during the period covered by this issue.